

UC Berkeley

IGS Poll

Title

Tabulations from a Late September 2024 Poll of California Likely Voters About Voting Preferences on Several Statewide Ballot Propositions

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7r94m3bc>

Author

DiCamillo, Mark

Publication Date

2024-10-04



University of California, Berkeley
Institute of Governmental Studies
109 Moses Hall, #2370
Berkeley, CA 94720-2370
Tel: 510-642-1473
Fax: 510-642-3020
Email: igs@berkeley.edu

**Tabulations from a Late September 2024 Poll of
California Likely Voters About Voting Preferences
on Several Statewide Ballot Propositions**

by the
Berkeley IGS Poll
Institute of Governmental Studies
University of California, Berkeley

September 25-October 1, 2024

Introduction

The statistical tabulations in this volume are based on a *Berkeley IGS Poll* completed online in English and Spanish September 25 – October 1, 2024 among 3,045 Californians considered likely to vote in the state’s November 2024 general election. The survey was conducted by the Institute of Governmental Studies (IGS) at the University of California, Berkeley. Funding for the poll was provided in part by the *Los Angeles Times*.

The poll was conducted by distributing email invitations to stratified random samples of the state’s registered voters. Each email invited voters to participate in a non-partisan survey conducted by the University and provided a link to the IGS website where the survey was housed. Reminder emails were distributed to non-responding voters and an opt out link was provided for voters not wishing to receive further email invitations.

Samples of California registered voters with email addresses were derived from information contained on the official voter registration rolls and provided to IGS by Political Data, Inc., a leading supplier of registered voter lists.

To protect the anonymity of respondents, voters’ email addresses and all other personally identifiable information derived from the original voter listing were purged from the data file and replaced with a unique and anonymous identification number during data processing. In addition, after the completion of data collection, post-stratification weights were applied to the survey data file to align the sample of registered voters to population characteristics of the registered voters statewide and within major regions of the state.

The sampling error associated with the survey results is difficult to calculate precisely because of sample stratification and the post-stratification weighting. Nevertheless, it is likely that findings based on the likely voter subsample are subject to a sampling error of approximately +/-2.5 percentage points at the 95% confidence level.

Regional definitions referenced in this report

The results from the state's geographic regions referenced in this volume are comprised of the following counties:

Los Angeles County (Los Angeles County)

Orange County (Orange County)

San Diego County (San Diego County)

Inland Empire (Riverside, San Bernardino and Imperial counties)

Central Coast (Ventura, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, Monterey, Santa Cruz, and San Benito counties)

Sacramento Valley (Shasta, Tehama, Glenn, Butte, Colusa, Yuba, Placer, Sutter, Yolo, El Dorado, and Sacramento counties)

San Joaquin Valley (San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Merced, Madera, Fresno, Kings, Tulare, and Kern counties)

Central Valley (net) (includes all counties in the Sacramento Valley and San Joaquin Valley referenced above)

SF Bay Area (Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco, Marin, Napa, Sonoma, Solano, San Mateo, Santa Clara).

North Coast/Sierras (Del Norte, Siskiyou, Modoc, Humboldt, Trinity, Lassen, Mendocino, Plumas, Sierra, Nevada, Lake, Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Tuolumne, Mono, Mariposa, Inyo counties.)

About the Institute of Governmental Studies

The Institute of Governmental Studies (IGS) is an interdisciplinary organized research unit that pursues a vigorous program of research, education, publication and public service. A component of the University of California system's flagship Berkeley campus, IGS is the oldest organized research unit in the UC system and the oldest public policy research center in the state. IGS's co-directors are Professor Eric Schickler and Associate Professor G. Cristina Mora.

IGS conducts periodic surveys of public opinion in California on matters of politics and public policy through its *Berkeley IGS Poll*. The poll seeks to provide a broad measure of contemporary public opinion, and to generate data for subsequent scholarly analysis. The director of the *Berkeley IGS Poll* is veteran pollster Mark DiCamillo. For a complete listing of stories issued by the *Berkeley IGS Poll* and a more detailed description of the methods used to conduct each survey go to <https://www.igs.berkeley.edu/research/berkeley-igs-poll>.

September 2024 Berkeley IGS Poll — Likely Voters

Table 1: Q15 PROPOSITION 32. RAISES MINIMUM WAGE. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Raises minimum wage as follows: For employers with 26 or more employees, to \$17 immediately, \$18 on January 1, 2025. For employers with 25 or fewer employees, to \$17 on January 1, 2025, \$18 on January 1, 2026. Fiscal Impact: State and local government costs could increase or decrease by up to hundreds of millions of dollars annually. State and local revenues likely would decrease by no more than a few hundred million dollars annually. Supporters: None submitted. Opponents: California Chamber of Commerce; California Restaurant Association; California Grocers Association. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 32? (Likely Voters)

	Region											Urbanicity			Party Registration				Likely Voters		
	Total	Los Angeles County	San Diego County	Orange County	Inland Empire	Central Coast	Central Valley (total)	Sacramento / North Valley	San Joaquin Valley	SF Bay Area	North Coast/Sieras	Urban	Sub-urban	Rural/na	Dem	Rep	NPP	Other	NPP / other	Likely	Not likely
unweighted n	3045.00	908.00	290.00	212.00	308.00	183.00	475.00	273.00	202.00	597.00	72.00	1258.00	1314.00	473.00	1493.00	1002.00	386.00	164.00	550.00	3045.00	0
weighted n	2822.00	700.00	248.00	243.00	320.00	167.00	501.00	288.00	212.00	582.00	61.00	1221.00	1198.00	403.00	1324.00	790.00	514.00	194.00	708.00	2822.00	0
Yes	0.46	0.50	0.39	0.37	0.44	0.41	0.39	0.45	0.30	0.56	0.49	0.52	0.42	0.40	0.69	0.13	0.41	0.35	0.39	0.46	0
No	0.36	0.32	0.39	0.49	0.39	0.37	0.42	0.35	0.52	0.26	0.37	0.31	0.38	0.44	0.12	0.72	0.38	0.44	0.40	0.36	0
Undecided	0.18	0.18	0.21	0.15	0.17	0.22	0.19	0.20	0.18	0.18	0.14	0.17	0.20	0.16	0.19	0.15	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.18	0

Table 2: Q15 PROPOSITION 32. RAISES MINIMUM WAGE. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Raises minimum wage as follows: For employers with 26 or more employees, to \$17 immediately, \$18 on January 1, 2025. For employers with 25 or fewer employees, to \$17 on January 1, 2025, \$18 on January 1, 2026. Fiscal Impact: State and local government costs could increase or decrease by up to hundreds of millions of dollars annually. State and local revenues likely would decrease by no more than a few hundred million dollars annually. Supporters: None submitted. Opponents: California Chamber of Commerce; California Restaurant Association; California Grocers Association. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 32? (Likely Voters)

	Gender			Age							Race / Ethnicity							Nativity	
	Total	Male	Female	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+ (net)	65-74	75	White non- Hispanic	Latino (net)	Spanish domi- nant (Latino)	English domi- nant/ bilin- gual (Latino)	Black	Asian/ Pac Isle	Amer In- dian/ Na- tive Amer	US	Another coun- try
unweighted n	3045.00	1472.00	1572.00	247.00	299.00	417.00	968.00	1114.00	647.00	467.00	1721.00	677.00	170.00	493.00	270.00	264.00	63.00	2486.00	503.00
weighted n	2822.00	1332.00	1490.00	353.00	437.00	438.00	747.00	847.00	517.00	330.00	1495.00	711.00	188.00	508.00	151.00	391.00	61.00	2279.00	475.00
Yes	0.46	0.44	0.47	0.48	0.56	0.49	0.39	0.44	0.46	0.40	0.42	0.53	0.67	0.48	0.62	0.46	0.55	0.45	0.53
No	0.36	0.41	0.31	0.33	0.27	0.34	0.39	0.40	0.40	0.41	0.41	0.29	0.19	0.32	0.20	0.31	0.27	0.37	0.30
Undecided	0.18	0.14	0.22	0.18	0.17	0.17	0.22	0.16	0.14	0.19	0.17	0.18	0.14	0.20	0.18	0.23	0.18	0.18	0.17

Table 3: Q15 PROPOSITION 32. RAISES MINIMUM WAGE. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Raises minimum wage as follows: For employers with 26 or more employees, to \$17 immediately, \$18 on January 1, 2025. For employers with 25 or fewer employees, to \$17 on January 1, 2025, \$18 on January 1, 2026. Fiscal Impact: State and local government costs could increase or decrease by up to hundreds of millions of dollars annually. State and local revenues likely would decrease by no more than a few hundred million dollars annually. Supporters: None submitted. Opponents: California Chamber of Commerce; California Restaurant Association; California Grocers Association. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 32? (Likely Voters)

	Political Ideology						Political Terms						Tenure		Union HH			
	Total	Strongly con- serva- tive	Somewhat con- serva- tive	Moderate	Somewhat lib- eral	Strongly lib- eral	Libertaria	Progressiv	Swifties	MAGA	Nationalist	Moms for Lib- erty	Evangelical Chris- tian	Pro- choice	Owner	Renter / Other	Yes	No
unweighted n	3045.00	321.00	525.00	963.00	635.00	537.00	199.00	838.00	106.00	493.00	119.00	47.00	267.00	1411.00	1956.00	1089.00	759.0	2223.00
weighted n	2822.00	316.00	474.00	895.00	557.00	503.00	150.00	757.00	110.00	504.00	121.00	32.00	258.00	1252.00	1562.00	1260.00	646.0	2105.00
Yes	0.46	0.16	0.17	0.40	0.65	0.83	0.26	0.73	0.65	0.13	0.31	0.52	0.21	0.60	0.40	0.53	0.5	0.45
No	0.36	0.74	0.69	0.39	0.13	0.03	0.66	0.09	0.28	0.69	0.49	0.33	0.67	0.21	0.42	0.29	0.3	0.38
Undecided	0.18	0.10	0.14	0.21	0.22	0.14	0.08	0.17	0.07	0.18	0.20	0.15	0.12	0.19	0.18	0.19	0.2	0.17

Table 4: Q15 PROPOSITION 32. RAISES MINIMUM WAGE. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Raises minimum wage as follows: For employers with 26 or more employees, to \$17 immediately, \$18 on January 1, 2025. For employers with 25 or fewer employees, to \$17 on January 1, 2025, \$18 on January 1, 2026. Fiscal Impact: State and local government costs could increase or decrease by up to hundreds of millions of dollars annually. State and local revenues likely would decrease by no more than a few hundred million dollars annually. Supporters: None submitted. Opponents: California Chamber of Commerce; California Restaurant Association; California Grocers Association. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 32? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Education				Household Income						Marital Status			
		High school grad or less	Some college/trade school	College graduate (BA)	Post graduate education	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000-\$39,999	\$40,000-\$59,999	\$60,000-\$99,999	\$100,000-\$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Married	Not married/live together	Separated/divorced/widowed	Single/never married
unweighted n	3045.00	297.0	875.00	1004.00	856.00	157.00	239.00	319.00	581.00	1008.00	589.00	1683.00	196.00	540.00	556.00
weighted n	2822.00	396.0	1077.00	842.00	497.00	246.00	285.00	325.00	567.00	847.00	421.00	1439.00	237.00	444.00	632.00
Yes	0.46	0.5	0.44	0.47	0.45	0.57	0.55	0.48	0.50	0.40	0.41	0.43	0.53	0.40	0.56
No	0.36	0.3	0.39	0.34	0.38	0.23	0.27	0.33	0.32	0.44	0.41	0.42	0.24	0.38	0.26
Undecided	0.18	0.2	0.17	0.19	0.17	0.20	0.17	0.20	0.18	0.17	0.17	0.16	0.23	0.22	0.18

Table 5: Q15 PROPOSITION 32. RAISES MINIMUM WAGE. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Raises minimum wage as follows: For employers with 26 or more employees, to \$17 immediately, \$18 on January 1, 2025. For employers with 25 or fewer employees, to \$17 on January 1, 2025, \$18 on January 1, 2026. Fiscal Impact: State and local government costs could increase or decrease by up to hundreds of millions of dollars annually. State and local revenues likely would decrease by no more than a few hundred million dollars annually. Supporters: None submitted. Opponents: California Chamber of Commerce; California Restaurant Association; California Grocers Association. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 32? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Party ID										Vote on Prop. 36			Vote on Prop. 32			Vote on Prop. 33		
		Democrat (net)	Strong Democrat	Not strong Democrat	Republican (net)	Strong Republican	Not strong Republican	Independent/other (net)	Democrat	Lean Republican	Pure Independent/other	Yes voters	No voters	Undecided voters	Yes voters	No voters	Undecided voters	Yes voters	No voters	Undecided voters
unweighted n	3045.00	1731.00	998.00	733.00	1054.00	488.00	564.00	913.00	401.00	310.00	202.00	1864.00	593.00	584.00	1392	1163	488	1054.00	1222.00	767.00
weighted n	2822.00	1578.00	817.00	762.00	990.00	464.00	525.00	873.00	397.00	288.00	188.00	1689.00	582.00	549.00	1294	1013	509	1052.00	1017.00	754.00
Yes	0.46	0.67	0.74	0.60	0.16	0.16	0.17	0.37	0.62	0.12	0.25	0.38	0.73	0.43	1	0	0	0.72	0.24	0.38
No	0.36	0.14	0.07	0.22	0.70	0.74	0.66	0.43	0.19	0.73	0.45	0.50	0.15	0.16	0	1	0	0.17	0.68	0.19
Undecided	0.18	0.19	0.19	0.18	0.14	0.10	0.17	0.20	0.19	0.15	0.30	0.13	0.12	0.41	0	0	1	0.11	0.08	0.43

Table 6: Q16 PROPOSITION 33. EXPANDS LOCAL GOVERNMENTS’ AUTHORITY TO ENACT RENT CONTROL ON RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Repeals Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act of 1995, which currently prohibits local ordinances limiting initial residential rental rates for new tenants or rent increases for existing tenants in certain residential properties. Fiscal Impact: Reduction in local property tax revenues of at least tens of millions of dollars annually due to likely expansion of rent control in some communities. Supporters: CA Nurses Assoc.; CA Alliance for Retired Americans; Mental Health Advocacy; Coalition for Economic Survival; Tenants Together. Opponents: California Council for Affordable Housing; Women Veterans Alliance; California Chamber of Commerce. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 33? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Region										Urbanicity			Party Registration					Likely Voters	
		Los Angeles County	San Diego County	Orange County	Inland Empire	Central Coast	Central Valley (total)	Sacramento / North Valley	San Joaquin Valley	SF Bay Area	North Coast/Sier-ras	Urban	Sub-urban	Rural/na	Dem	Rep	NPP	Other	NPP / other	Likely	Not likely
unweighted n	3045.00	908.00	290.00	212.00	308.00	183.00	475.00	273.00	202.00	597.00	72.00	1258.00	1314.00	473.00	1493.00	1002.00	386.00	164.00	550.00	3045.00	0
weighted n	2822.00	700.00	248.00	243.00	320.00	167.00	501.00	288.00	212.00	582.00	61.00	1221.00	1198.00	403.00	1324.00	790.00	514.00	194.00	708.00	2822.00	0
Yes	0.37	0.40	0.32	0.28	0.38	0.34	0.35	0.41	0.28	0.42	0.40	0.42	0.34	0.30	0.50	0.20	0.32	0.34	0.32	0.37	0
No	0.36	0.32	0.41	0.42	0.37	0.40	0.40	0.30	0.54	0.32	0.32	0.31	0.38	0.45	0.21	0.59	0.38	0.40	0.38	0.36	0
Undecided	0.27	0.28	0.27	0.29	0.25	0.26	0.25	0.29	0.19	0.26	0.28	0.27	0.28	0.24	0.29	0.21	0.31	0.26	0.29	0.27	0

Table 7: Q16 PROPOSITION 33. EXPANDS LOCAL GOVERNMENTS’ AUTHORITY TO ENACT RENT CONTROL ON RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Repeals Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act of 1995, which currently prohibits local ordinances limiting initial residential rental rates for new tenants or rent increases for existing tenants in certain residential properties. Fiscal Impact: Reduction in local property tax revenues of at least tens of millions of dollars annually due to likely expansion of rent control in some communities. Supporters: CA Nurses Assoc.; CA Alliance for Retired Americans; Mental Health Advocacy; Coalition for Economic Survival; Tenants Together. Opponents: California Council for Affordable Housing; Women Veterans Alliance; California Chamber of Commerce. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 33? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Gender		Age							Race / Ethnicity							Nativity	
		Male	Female	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+ (net)	65-74	75	White non-Hispanic	Latino (net)	Spanish dominant (Latino)	English dominant/bilingual (Latino)	Black	Asian/Pac Isle	Amer Indian/Native Amer	US	Another country
unweighted n	3045.00	1472.00	1572.00	247.00	299.00	417.00	968.00	1114.00	647.00	467.00	1721.00	677.00	170.00	493.00	270.00	264.00	63.00	2486.00	503.00
weighted n	2822.00	1332.00	1490.00	353.00	437.00	438.00	747.00	847.00	517.00	330.00	1495.00	711.00	188.00	508.00	151.00	391.00	61.00	2279.00	475.00
Yes	0.37	0.36	0.38	0.42	0.48	0.40	0.33	0.32	0.32	0.31	0.30	0.44	0.49	0.42	0.58	0.48	0.27	0.36	0.44
No	0.36	0.44	0.29	0.31	0.25	0.33	0.41	0.41	0.39	0.45	0.42	0.31	0.36	0.29	0.26	0.24	0.28	0.36	0.36
Undecided	0.27	0.20	0.33	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.26	0.27	0.29	0.24	0.28	0.25	0.15	0.28	0.16	0.28	0.45	0.27	0.20

Table 8: Q16 PROPOSITION 33. EXPANDS LOCAL GOVERNMENTS’ AUTHORITY TO ENACT RENT CONTROL ON RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Repeals Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act of 1995, which currently prohibits local ordinances limiting initial residential rental rates for new tenants or rent increases for existing tenants in certain residential properties. Fiscal Impact: Reduction in local property tax revenues of at least tens of millions of dollars annually due to likely expansion of rent control in some communities. Supporters: CA Nurses Assoc.; CA Alliance for Retired Americans; Mental Health Advocacy; Coalition for Economic Survival; Tenants Together. Opponents: California Council for Affordable Housing; Women Veterans Alliance; California Chamber of Commerce. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 33? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Political Ideology					Political Terms						Tenure		Union HH			
		Strongly conservative	Somewhat conservative	Moderate	Somewhat liberal	Strongly liberal	Libertarian	Progressive	Swifties	MAGA	Nationalist	Moms for Liberty	Evangelical Christian	Pro-choice	Owner	Renter / Other	Yes	No
unweighted n	3045.00	321.00	525.00	963.00	635.00	537.00	199.00	838.00	106.00	493.00	119.00	47.00	267.00	1411.00	1956.00	1089.00	759.00	2223.00
weighted n	2822.00	316.00	474.00	895.00	557.00	503.00	150.00	757.00	110.00	504.00	121.00	32.00	258.00	1252.00	1562.00	1260.00	646.00	2105.00
Yes	0.37	0.24	0.24	0.31	0.44	0.64	0.19	0.58	0.45	0.24	0.27	0.38	0.24	0.45	0.28	0.48	0.43	0.36
No	0.36	0.67	0.50	0.42	0.23	0.09	0.67	0.16	0.31	0.56	0.41	0.44	0.60	0.26	0.44	0.26	0.29	0.38
Undecided	0.27	0.09	0.26	0.27	0.33	0.27	0.14	0.26	0.24	0.20	0.32	0.19	0.15	0.29	0.28	0.26	0.28	0.26

Table 9: Q16 PROPOSITION 33. EXPANDS LOCAL GOVERNMENTS’ AUTHORITY TO ENACT RENT CONTROL ON RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Repeals Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act of 1995, which currently prohibits local ordinances limiting initial residential rental rates for new tenants or rent increases for existing tenants in certain residential properties. Fiscal Impact: Reduction in local property tax revenues of at least tens of millions of dollars annually due to likely expansion of rent control in some communities. Supporters: CA Nurses Assoc.; CA Alliance for Retired Americans; Mental Health Advocacy; Coalition for Economic Survival; Tenants Together. Opponents: California Council for Affordable Housing; Women Veterans Alliance; California Chamber of Commerce. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 33? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Education				Household Income						Marital Status			
		High school grad or less	Some college/trade school	College graduate (BA)	Post graduate education	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000-\$39,999	\$40,000-\$59,999	\$60,000-\$99,999	\$100,000-\$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Married	Not married/live together	Separated/divorced/widowed	Single/never married
unweighted n	3045.00	297.00	875.00	1004.00	856.00	157.00	239.00	319.00	581.00	1008.00	589.00	1683.00	196.00	540.00	556.00
weighted n	2822.00	396.00	1077.00	842.00	497.00	246.00	285.00	325.00	567.00	847.00	421.00	1439.00	237.00	444.00	632.00
Yes	0.37	0.41	0.36	0.39	0.33	0.55	0.41	0.46	0.41	0.31	0.29	0.32	0.44	0.38	0.47
No	0.36	0.30	0.40	0.33	0.39	0.28	0.29	0.28	0.34	0.41	0.46	0.42	0.23	0.37	0.27
Undecided	0.27	0.28	0.24	0.28	0.27	0.17	0.31	0.25	0.26	0.28	0.26	0.26	0.33	0.25	0.26

Table 10: Q16 PROPOSITION 33. EXPANDS LOCAL GOVERNMENTS’ AUTHORITY TO ENACT RENT CONTROL ON RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Repeals Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act of 1995, which currently prohibits local ordinances limiting initial residential rental rates for new tenants or rent increases for existing tenants in certain residential properties. Fiscal Impact: Reduction in local property tax revenues of at least tens of millions of dollars annually due to likely expansion of rent control in some communities. Supporters: CA Nurses Assoc.; CA Alliance for Retired Americans; Mental Health Advocacy; Coalition for Economic Survival; Tenants Together. Opponents: California Council for Affordable Housing; Women Veterans Alliance; California Chamber of Commerce. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 33? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Party ID										Vote on Prop. 36			Vote on Prop. 32			Vote on Prop. 33		
		Democrat (net)	Strong Democrat	Not strong Democrat	Republican (net)	Strong Republican	Not strong Republican	Independent/other (net)	Democrat	Lean Republican	Pure Independent/other	Yes voters	No voters	Undecided voters	Yes voters	No voters	Undecided voters	Yes voters	No voters	Undecided voters
unweighted n	3045.00	1731.00	998.00	733.00	1054.00	488.00	564.00	913.00	401.00	310.00	202.00	1864.00	593.00	584.00	1392.00	1163.00	488.00	1054	1222	767
weighted n	2822.00	1578.00	817.00	762.00	990.00	464.00	525.00	873.00	397.00	288.00	188.00	1689.00	582.00	549.00	1294.00	1013.00	509.00	1052	1017	754
Yes	0.37	0.49	0.52	0.46	0.22	0.18	0.25	0.33	0.48	0.17	0.27	0.34	0.61	0.22	0.59	0.18	0.22	1	0	0
No	0.36	0.22	0.16	0.28	0.58	0.64	0.53	0.40	0.26	0.59	0.39	0.47	0.24	0.14	0.19	0.68	0.16	0	1	0
Undecided	0.27	0.29	0.33	0.26	0.20	0.18	0.22	0.27	0.26	0.24	0.34	0.19	0.15	0.63	0.22	0.14	0.62	0	0	1

Table 11: Q17 PROPOSITION 36. ALLOWS FELONY CHARGES AND INCREASES SENTENCES FOR CERTAIN DRUG AND THEFT CRIMES. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Allows felony charges for possessing certain drugs and for thefts under \$950, if defendant has two prior drug or theft convictions. Fiscal Impact: State criminal justice costs likely ranging from several tens of millions of dollars to the low hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Local criminal justice costs likely in the tens of millions of dollars annually. Supporters: Crime Victims United of California; California District Attorneys Association; Family Business Association of California. Opponents: Diana Becton, District Attorney Contra Costa County; Crime Survivors for Safety and Justice. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 36? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Region										Urbanicity			Party Registration					Likely Voters	
		Los Angeles County	San Diego County	Orange County	Inland Empire	Central Coast	Central Valley (total)	Sacramento / North Valley	San Joaquin Valley	SF Bay Area	North Coast/Sier-ras	Urban	Sub-urban	Rural/na	Dem	Rep	NPP	Other	NPP / other	Likely	Not likely
unweighted n	3045.00	908.00	290.00	212.00	308.00	183.00	475.00	273.00	202.00	597.00	72.00	1258.00	1314.00	473.00	1493.00	1002.00	386.00	164.00	550.00	3045.00	0
weighted n	2822.00	700.00	248.00	243.00	320.00	167.00	501.00	288.00	212.00	582.00	61.00	1221.00	1198.00	403.00	1324.00	790.00	514.00	194.00	708.00	2822.00	0
Yes	0.60	0.59	0.66	0.67	0.69	0.55	0.62	0.47	0.82	0.49	0.68	0.58	0.60	0.68	0.47	0.83	0.57	0.60	0.58	0.60	0
No	0.21	0.20	0.15	0.17	0.16	0.17	0.23	0.36	0.06	0.27	0.13	0.25	0.18	0.15	0.28	0.06	0.23	0.21	0.22	0.21	0
Undecided	0.20	0.21	0.19	0.16	0.15	0.28	0.15	0.17	0.12	0.24	0.19	0.18	0.22	0.18	0.24	0.11	0.20	0.19	0.20	0.20	0

Table 12: Q17 PROPOSITION 36. ALLOWS FELONY CHARGES AND INCREASES SENTENCES FOR CERTAIN DRUG AND THEFT CRIMES. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Allows felony charges for possessing certain drugs and for thefts under \$950, if defendant has two prior drug or theft convictions. Fiscal Impact: State criminal justice costs likely ranging from several tens of millions of dollars to the low hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Local criminal justice costs likely in the tens of millions of dollars annually. Supporters: Crime Victims United of California; California District Attorneys Association; Family Business Association of California. Opponents: Diana Becton, District Attorney Contra Costa County; Crime Survivors for Safety and Justice. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 36? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Gender		Age							Race / Ethnicity							Nativity	
		Male	Female	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+ (net)	65-74	75	White non-Hispanic	Latino (net)	Spanish dominant (Latino)	English dominant/bilingual (Latino)	Black	Asian/Pac Isle	Amer Indian/Native Amer	US	Another country
unweighted n	3045.00	1472.00	1572.00	247.00	299.00	417.00	968.00	1114.00	647.00	467.00	1721.00	677.00	170.00	493.00	270.00	264.00	63.00	2486.00	503.00
weighted n	2822.00	1332.00	1490.00	353.00	437.00	438.00	747.00	847.00	517.00	330.00	1495.00	711.00	188.00	508.00	151.00	391.00	61.00	2279.00	475.00
Yes	0.60	0.65	0.56	0.42	0.54	0.56	0.66	0.66	0.66	0.66	0.58	0.73	0.84	0.69	0.37	0.53	0.55	0.57	0.77
No	0.21	0.20	0.21	0.37	0.25	0.28	0.13	0.15	0.14	0.15	0.21	0.13	0.06	0.16	0.46	0.26	0.34	0.23	0.11
Undecided	0.20	0.15	0.23	0.21	0.20	0.16	0.21	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.21	0.14	0.10	0.15	0.17	0.21	0.11	0.21	0.12

Table 13: Q17 PROPOSITION 36. ALLOWS FELONY CHARGES AND INCREASES SENTENCES FOR CERTAIN DRUG AND THEFT CRIMES. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Allows felony charges for possessing certain drugs and for thefts under \$950, if defendant has two prior drug or theft convictions. Fiscal Impact: State criminal justice costs likely ranging from several tens of millions of dollars to the low hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Local criminal justice costs likely in the tens of millions of dollars annually. Supporters: Crime Victims United of California; California District Attorneys Association; Family Business Association of California. Opponents: Diana Becton, District Attorney Contra Costa County; Crime Survivors for Safety and Justice. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 36? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Political Ideology					Political Terms						Tenure		Union HH			
		Strongly con- serva- tive	Somewhat con- serva- tive	Moderate	Somewhat lib- eral	Strongly lib- eral	Libertarian	Progressive	Swifties	MAGA	Nationalist	Moms for Lib- erty	Evangelical Pro- Chris- tian choice	Owner	Renter / Other	Yes	No	
unweighted n	3045.00	321.00	525.00	963.00	635.00	537.00	199.00	838.00	106.00	493.00	119.00	47.00	267.00	1411.00	1956.00	1089.00	759.00	2223.0
weighted n	2822.00	316.00	474.00	895.00	557.00	503.00	150.00	757.00	110.00	504.00	121.00	32.00	258.00	1252.00	1562.00	1260.00	646.00	2105.0
Yes	0.60	0.90	0.77	0.68	0.46	0.27	0.70	0.40	0.52	0.85	0.93	0.63	0.86	0.47	0.64	0.54	0.60	0.6
No	0.21	0.04	0.08	0.15	0.22	0.52	0.13	0.39	0.15	0.06	0.01	0.26	0.06	0.29	0.17	0.25	0.22	0.2
Undecided	0.20	0.06	0.15	0.16	0.31	0.21	0.17	0.22	0.33	0.08	0.06	0.11	0.08	0.24	0.19	0.21	0.17	0.2

Table 14: Q17 PROPOSITION 36. ALLOWS FELONY CHARGES AND INCREASES SENTENCES FOR CERTAIN DRUG AND THEFT CRIMES. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Allows felony charges for possessing certain drugs and for thefts under \$950, if defendant has two prior drug or theft convictions. Fiscal Impact: State criminal justice costs likely ranging from several tens of millions of dollars to the low hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Local criminal justice costs likely in the tens of millions of dollars annually. Supporters: Crime Victims United of California; California District Attorneys Association; Family Business Association of California. Opponents: Diana Becton, District Attorney Contra Costa County; Crime Survivors for Safety and Justice. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 36? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Education				Household Income						Marital Status			
		High school grad or less	Some college/trade school	College graduate (BA)	Post graduate education	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000-\$39,999	\$40,000-\$59,999	\$60,000-\$99,999	\$100,000-\$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Married	Not married/live together	Separated/divorced/widowed	Single/never married
unweighted n	3045.00	297.0	875.00	1004.00	856.00	157.00	239.00	319.00	581.00	1008.00	589.00	1683.00	196.00	540.00	556.00
weighted n	2822.00	396.0	1077.00	842.00	497.00	246.00	285.00	325.00	567.00	847.00	421.00	1439.00	237.00	444.00	632.00
Yes	0.60	0.6	0.65	0.56	0.56	0.45	0.65	0.60	0.61	0.62	0.59	0.65	0.58	0.63	0.48
No	0.21	0.2	0.19	0.22	0.24	0.43	0.15	0.17	0.21	0.18	0.21	0.17	0.20	0.15	0.34
Undecided	0.20	0.2	0.16	0.23	0.20	0.13	0.19	0.23	0.18	0.20	0.20	0.18	0.21	0.22	0.18

Table 15: Q17 PROPOSITION 36. ALLOWS FELONY CHARGES AND INCREASES SENTENCES FOR CERTAIN DRUG AND THEFT CRIMES. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Allows felony charges for possessing certain drugs and for thefts under \$950, if defendant has two prior drug or theft convictions. Fiscal Impact: State criminal justice costs likely ranging from several tens of millions of dollars to the low hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Local criminal justice costs likely in the tens of millions of dollars annually. Supporters: Crime Victims United of California; California District Attorneys Association; Family Business Association of California. Opponents: Diana Becton, District Attorney Contra Costa County; Crime Survivors for Safety and Justice. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 36? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Party ID									Vote on Prop. 36			Vote on Prop. 32			Vote on Prop. 33			
		Democrat (net)	Strong Democrat	Not strong Democrat	Republican (net)	Strong Republican	Not strong Republican	Independent/other (net)	Democrat	Lean Republican	Pure Independent/other	Yes voters	No voters	Undecided voters	Yes voters	No voters	Undecided voters	Yes voters	No voters	Undecided voters
unweighted n	3045.00	1731.00	998.00	733.00	1054.00	488.00	564.00	913.00	401.00	310.00	202.00	1864	593	584	1392.00	1163.00	488.00	1054.00	1222.00	767.00
weighted n	2822.00	1578.00	817.00	762.00	990.00	464.00	525.00	873.00	397.00	288.00	188.00	1689	582	549	1294.00	1013.00	509.00	1052.00	1017.00	754.00
Yes	0.60	0.45	0.45	0.46	0.84	0.89	0.79	0.59	0.43	0.80	0.58	1	0	0	0.49	0.83	0.43	0.54	0.79	0.42
No	0.21	0.30	0.28	0.32	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.23	0.35	0.07	0.19	0	1	0	0.33	0.09	0.14	0.34	0.14	0.12
Undecided	0.20	0.24	0.27	0.22	0.10	0.05	0.14	0.19	0.21	0.12	0.23	0	0	1	0.18	0.09	0.43	0.12	0.08	0.46

Table 16: Q18 Which of the following best describes the main reason why you are intending to vote YES on Proposition 36? (RANDOMIZE) (Likely Voters Who Intend to Vote Yes on Prop 36)

	Total	Region										Urbanicity			Party Registration					Likely Voters	
		Los Angeles County	San Diego County	Orange County	Inland Empire	Central Coast	Central Valley (total)	Sacramento / North Valley	San Joaquin Valley	SF Bay Area	North Coast/Sier-ras	Urban	Sub-urban	Rural/na	Dem	Rep	NPP	Other	NPP / other	Likely	Not likely
unweighted n	1864.00	519.00	190.00	146.00	228.00	105.00	320.00	163.00	157.00	312.00	44.00	714.00	833.00	317.00	694.00	844.00	224.00	102.00	326.00	1864.00	0
weighted n	1689.00	412.00	163.00	163.00	221.00	92.00	310.00	136.00	174.00	285.00	42.00	703.00	714.00	272.00	625.00	656.00	292.00	116.00	408.00	1689.00	0
Those convicted of repeatedly breaking the law should receive harsher punishments	0.61	0.67	0.54	0.59	0.61	0.69	0.59	0.56	0.62	0.57	0.61	0.59	0.61	0.67	0.65	0.59	0.59	0.56	0.58	0.61	0
More people who break the law should be prosecuted	0.21	0.17	0.22	0.24	0.15	0.23	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.23	0.15	0.19	0.23	0.20	0.16	0.25	0.22	0.22	0.22	0.21	0
It will reduce future crimes	0.16	0.14	0.22	0.15	0.21	0.07	0.10	0.12	0.09	0.17	0.24	0.18	0.14	0.12	0.15	0.15	0.16	0.17	0.17	0.16	0
Other reasons	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.04	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.01	0
Can't specify	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.01	0

Table 17: Q18 Which of the following best describes the main reason why you are intending to vote YES on Proposition 36? (RANDOMIZE) (Likely Voters Who Intend to Vote Yes on Prop 36)

	Gender			Age							Race / Ethnicity							Nativity	
	Total	Male	Female	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+ (net)	65-74	75	White non- Hispanic	Latino (net)	Spanish domi- nant (Latino)	English domi- nant/ biling- ual (Latino)	Black	Asian/ Pac Isle	Amer In- dian/ Nati- ve Amer	US	Another coun- try
unweighted n	1864.00	1011.00	852.00	105.00	144.00	231.00	647.00	737.00	431.00	306.00	1044.00	466.00	141.00	317.00	118.00	151.00	36.00	1456.00	378.00
weighted n	1689.00	860.00	829.00	148.00	237.00	246.00	496.00	561.00	344.00	217.00	865.00	519.00	158.00	350.00	56.00	206.00	33.00	1289.00	366.00
Those convicted of repeatedly breaking the law should receive harsher punishments	0.61	0.59	0.63	0.70	0.65	0.61	0.57	0.61	0.60	0.62	0.58	0.68	0.59	0.72	0.68	0.59	0.68	0.62	0.57
More people who break the law should be prosecuted	0.21	0.23	0.19	0.13	0.15	0.16	0.25	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.27	0.15	0.18	0.12	0.13	0.11	0.28	0.22	0.16
It will reduce future crimes	0.16	0.15	0.16	0.16	0.18	0.19	0.16	0.12	0.13	0.10	0.13	0.14	0.16	0.14	0.14	0.30	0.03	0.14	0.23
Other reasons	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.02
Can't specify	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02

Table 18: Q18 Which of the following best describes the main reason why you are intending to vote YES on Proposition 36? (RANDOMIZE) (Likely Voters Who Intend to Vote Yes on Prop 36)

	Total	Political Ideology					Political Terms							Tenure		Union HH		
		Strongly con- serva- tive	Somewhat con- serva- tive	Moderate	Somewhat lib- eral	Strongly lib- eral	Libertaria n	Progressiv e	Swifties	MAGA	Nationalist	Moms for Lib- erty	Evangelical Chris- tian	Pro- choice	Owner	Renter / Other	Yes	No
unweighted n	1864.00	284.00	440.00	679.00	281.00	150.00	151.00	310.00	48.00	427.00	107.00	37.00	225.00	680.00	1296.00	568.00	443.00	1388.00
weighted n	1689.00	286.00	365.00	612.00	258.00	134.00	106.00	300.00	57.00	430.00	112.00	20.00	222.00	594.00	1006.00	683.00	391.00	1260.00
Those convicted of repeatedly breaking the law should receive harsher punishments	0.61	0.58	0.54	0.63	0.65	0.71	0.36	0.63	0.75	0.55	0.55	0.54	0.69	0.65	0.61	0.61	0.59	0.62
More people who break the law should be prosecuted	0.21	0.24	0.28	0.17	0.20	0.11	0.33	0.16	0.12	0.25	0.23	0.29	0.17	0.17	0.23	0.18	0.24	0.20
It will reduce future crimes	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.18	0.12	0.15	0.27	0.18	0.13	0.20	0.21	0.13	0.12	0.15	0.14	0.17	0.15	0.16
Other reasons	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01
Can't specify	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01

Table 19: Q18 Which of the following best describes the main reason why you are intending to vote YES on Proposition 36? (RANDOMIZE) (Likely Voters Who Intend to Vote Yes on Prop 36)

	Education					Household Income					Marital Status				
	Total	High school grad or less	Some college/trade school	College graduate (BA)	Post graduate education	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000-\$39,999	\$40,000-\$59,999	\$60,000-\$99,999	\$100,000-\$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Married	Not married/live together	Separated/divorced/widowed	Single/never married
unweighted n	1864.00	198.00	575.00	617.00	467.00	82.00	145.00	190.00	344.00	641.00	369.00	1115.00	103.00	335.00	275.00
weighted n	1689.00	238.00	699.00	468.00	279.00	110.00	186.00	194.00	344.00	529.00	246.00	931.00	138.00	279.00	304.00
Those convicted of repeatedly breaking the law should receive harsher punishments	0.61	0.66	0.62	0.61	0.54	0.49	0.62	0.68	0.64	0.59	0.61	0.61	0.63	0.59	0.61
More people who break the law should be prosecuted	0.21	0.18	0.22	0.19	0.23	0.32	0.19	0.14	0.17	0.23	0.24	0.20	0.23	0.23	0.19
It will reduce future crimes	0.16	0.11	0.14	0.17	0.20	0.15	0.17	0.14	0.18	0.15	0.14	0.16	0.13	0.15	0.16
Other reasons	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02
Can't specify	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.01

Table 20: Q18 Which of the following best describes the main reason why you are intending to vote YES on Proposition 36? (RANDOMIZE) (Likely Voters Who Intend to Vote Yes on Prop 36)

	Total	Party ID										Vote on Prop. 36			Vote on Prop. 32			Vote on Prop. 33		
		Democrat (net)	Strong Democrat	Not strong Democrat	Republican (net)	Strong Republican	Not strong Republican	Independent/other (net)	Lean Democrat	Lean Republican	Pure Independent/other	Yes voters	No voters	Undecided voters	Yes voters	No voters	Undecided voters	Yes voters	No voters	Undecided voters
unweighted n	1864.00	798.00	446.00	352.00	908.00	427.00	480.00	581.00	178.00	274.00	129.00	1864.00	0	0	665.00	982.00	217.00	563.00	977.00	324.00
weighted n	1689.00	718.00	367.00	350.00	828.00	412.00	416.00	513.00	173.00	231.00	109.00	1689.00	0	0	633.00	837.00	219.00	573.00	800.00	317.00
Those convicted of repeatedly breaking the law should receive harsher punishments	0.61	0.64	0.62	0.67	0.59	0.56	0.61	0.59	0.63	0.56	0.60	0.61	0	0	0.65	0.58	0.60	0.64	0.60	0.60
More people who break the law should be prosecuted	0.21	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.25	0.24	0.25	0.23	0.18	0.30	0.15	0.21	0	0	0.16	0.26	0.17	0.18	0.25	0.16
It will reduce future crimes	0.16	0.16	0.18	0.14	0.15	0.18	0.12	0.16	0.18	0.13	0.18	0.16	0	0	0.17	0.15	0.16	0.16	0.13	0.22
Other reasons	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.07	0.01	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.01
Can't specify	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0	0	0.01	0.00	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.01

Table 21: Q19 Which of the following best describes the main reason why you are intending to vote NO on Proposition 36? (RANDOMIZE) (Likely Voters Who Intend to Vote No on Prop 36)

	Total	Region										Urbanicity			Party Registration					Likely Voters	
		Los Angeles County	San Diego County	Orange County	Inland Empire	Central Coast	Central Valley (total)	Sacramento / North Valley	San Joaquin Valley	SF Bay Area	North Coast/Sier-ras	Urban	Sub-urban	Rural/na	Dem	Rep	NPP	Other	NPP / other	Likely	Not likely
unweighted n	593.00	192.00	49.00	37.00	41.00	33.00	81.00	62.00	19.00	146.00	14.00	290.00	230.00	73.00	409.00	72.00	77.00	35.00	112.00	593.00	0
weighted n	582.00	141.00	38.00	41.00	50.00	28.00	117.00	104.00	13.00	159.00	8.00	304.00	219.00	59.00	377.00	47.00	118.00	40.00	158.00	582.00	0
It focuses too much on punishment and not enough on rehabilitation	0.54	0.51	0.48	0.57	0.72	0.46	0.55	0.57	0.42	0.53	0.57	0.55	0.54	0.49	0.56	0.19	0.53	0.83	0.61	0.54	0
It would cause greater harm to the state's racial and ethnic populations	0.16	0.20	0.10	0.15	0.05	0.35	0.06	0.04	0.21	0.24	0.07	0.19	0.17	0.02	0.22	0.03	0.11	0.01	0.08	0.16	0
It would cause greater harm to low-income people	0.11	0.10	0.08	0.11	0.09	0.03	0.18	0.19	0.13	0.09	0.08	0.10	0.08	0.28	0.09	0.16	0.16	0.14	0.15	0.11	0
Recent criminal justice reforms already address the issues	0.06	0.03	0.13	0.12	0.01	0.05	0.08	0.08	0.13	0.03	0.16	0.03	0.07	0.12	0.05	0.13	0.06	0.00	0.04	0.06	0
Proposition 36 seeks to change	0.10	0.12	0.18	0.03	0.13	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.11	0.08	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.07	0.06	0.40	0.14	0.02	0.11	0.10	0
Other reasons	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.04	0.05	0.00	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0
Can't specify	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.04	0.05	0.00	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0

Table 22: Q19 Which of the following best describes the main reason why you are intending to vote NO on Proposition 36? (RANDOMIZE) (Likely Voters Who Intend to Vote No on Prop 36)

	Gender		Age							Race / Ethnicity							Nativity		
	Total	Male	Female	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+ (net)	65-74	75	White non- Hispanic	Latino (net)	Spanish domi- nant (Latino)	English domi- nant/ bilin- gual (Latino)	Black	Asian/ Pac/ Isle	Amer In- dian/ Na- tive Amer	US	Another coun- try
unweighted n	593.00	246.00	347.00	92.00	97.00	107.00	142.00	155.00	93.00	62.00	322.00	104.00	11.00	92.00	97.00	64.00	22.00	528.00	59.00
weighted n	582.00	268.00	314.00	132.00	111.00	122.00	94.00	124.00	74.00	50.00	311.00	92.00	11.00	80.00	69.00	102.00	21.00	522.00	54.00
It focuses too much on punishment and not enough on rehabilitation	0.54	0.55	0.53	0.54	0.68	0.55	0.54	0.41	0.42	0.40	0.54	0.40	0.36	0.40	0.67	0.66	0.76	0.55	0.42
It would cause greater harm to the state's racial and ethnic populations	0.16	0.14	0.19	0.19	0.12	0.23	0.18	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.14	0.24	0.13	0.26	0.18	0.19	0.01	0.17	0.12
It would cause greater harm to low-income people	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.18	0.07	0.11	0.10	0.08	0.11	0.03	0.12	0.15	0.09	0.16	0.05	0.03	0.13	0.10	0.20
Recent criminal justice reforms already address the issues	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.03	0.05	0.02	0.06	0.12	0.13	0.12	0.08	0.02	0.05	0.02	0.04	0.04	0.00	0.06	0.01
Proposition 36 seeks to change	0.10	0.12	0.08	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.10	0.23	0.18	0.31	0.10	0.15	0.00	0.17	0.02	0.08	0.11	0.09	0.17
Other reasons	0.10	0.12	0.08	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.10	0.23	0.18	0.31	0.10	0.15	0.00	0.17	0.02	0.08	0.11	0.09	0.17
Can't specify	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.03	0.04	0.37	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.07

Table 23: Q19 Which of the following best describes the main reason why you are intending to vote NO on Proposition 36? (RANDOMIZE) (Likely Voters Who Intend to Vote No on Prop 36)

	Total	Political Ideology					Political Terms							Tenure		Union HH		
		Strongly con- serva- tive	Somewhat con- serva- tive	Moderate	Somewhat lib- eral	Strongly lib- eral	Libertarian	Progressive	Swifties	MAGA	Nationalist	Moms for Liberty	Evangelical Christian	Pro-choice	Owner	Renter / Other	Yes	No
unweighted n	593.00	17.00	36.00	129.00	147.00	255.00	27.00	306.00	26.00	30.00	3.00	6.00	18.00	373.00	316.00	277.00	179.00	407.00
weighted n	582.00	13.00	40.00	137.00	124.00	262.00	19.00	292.00	17.00	31.00	2.00	9.00	15.00	360.00	265.00	317.00	144.00	431.00
It focuses too much on punishment and not enough on rehabilitation	0.54	0.09	0.34	0.51	0.56	0.59	0.58	0.61	0.42	0.15	0.11	0.24	0.45	0.58	0.45	0.61	0.52	0.54
It would cause greater harm to the state's racial and ethnic populations	0.16	0.00	0.02	0.10	0.14	0.24	0.11	0.18	0.25	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.18	0.17	0.16	0.26	0.13
It would cause greater harm to low-income people	0.11	0.15	0.22	0.08	0.12	0.10	0.11	0.11	0.14	0.36	0.83	0.29	0.13	0.12	0.10	0.12	0.09	0.12
Recent criminal justice reforms already address the issues	0.06	0.16	0.06	0.07	0.10	0.02	0.04	0.03	0.10	0.14	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.05	0.09	0.03	0.05	0.06
Proposition 36 seeks to change	0.10	0.29	0.29	0.21	0.04	0.03	0.16	0.05	0.01	0.22	0.06	0.01	0.23	0.05	0.14	0.07	0.06	0.11
Other reasons	0.03	0.31	0.07	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.08	0.10	0.00	0.46	0.00	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.02	0.03

Table 24: Q19 Which of the following best describes the main reason why you are intending to vote NO on Proposition 36? (RANDOMIZE) (Likely Voters Who Intend to Vote No on Prop 36)

	Total	Education				Household Income						Marital Status			
		High school grad or less	Some college/trade school	College graduate (BA)	Post graduate education	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000-\$39,999	\$40,000-\$59,999	\$60,000-\$99,999	\$100,000-\$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Married	Not married/live together	Separated/divorced/widowed	Single/never married
unweighted n	593.00	37.00	145.00	199.00	211.00	44.00	44.00	61.00	128.00	186.00	108.00	279.00	53.00	83.00	168.00
weighted n	582.00	78.00	201.00	184.00	119.00	105.00	43.00	55.00	121.00	150.00	90.00	244.00	48.00	68.00	214.00
It focuses too much on punishment and not enough on rehabilitation	0.54	0.67	0.53	0.53	0.49	0.68	0.59	0.58	0.48	0.49	0.52	0.49	0.44	0.45	0.65
It would cause greater harm to the state's racial and ethnic populations	0.16	0.11	0.12	0.24	0.15	0.03	0.13	0.07	0.24	0.20	0.25	0.20	0.28	0.14	0.11
It would cause greater harm to low-income people	0.11	0.08	0.16	0.05	0.13	0.15	0.12	0.04	0.11	0.12	0.10	0.09	0.10	0.14	0.13
Recent criminal justice reforms already address the issues	0.06	0.02	0.04	0.08	0.08	0.01	0.05	0.04	0.06	0.09	0.01	0.07	0.05	0.06	0.05
Proposition 36 seeks to change other reasons	0.10	0.03	0.13	0.07	0.12	0.14	0.10	0.12	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.10	0.13	0.19	0.06
Can't specify	0.03	0.09	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.15	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.01

Table 25: Q19 Which of the following best describes the main reason why you are intending to vote NO on Proposition 36? (RANDOMIZE) (Likely Voters Who Intend to Vote No on Prop 36)

	Party ID											Vote on Prop. 36			Vote on Prop. 32			Vote on Prop. 33		
	Total	Democrat (net)	Strong Democrat	Not strong Democrat	Republican (net)	Strong Republican	Not strong Republican	Independent/other (net)	Lean Democrat	Lean Republican	Pure Independent/other	Yes voters	No voters	Undecided voters	Yes voters	No voters	Undecided voters	Yes voters	No voters	Undecided voters
unweighted n	593.00	479.00	273.00	206.00	66.00	31.00	35.00	179.00	122.00	15.00	42.00	0	593.00	0	422.00	105.00	66.00	328.00	162.00	103.00
weighted n	582.00	478.00	231.00	247.00	63.00	28.00	35.00	197.00	140.00	22.00	35.00	0	582.00	0	423.00	88.00	71.00	356.00	138.00	88.00
It focuses too much on punishment and not enough on rehabilitation	0.54	0.59	0.56	0.63	0.10	0.12	0.08	0.58	0.67	0.03	0.54	0	0.54	0	0.59	0.30	0.57	0.56	0.48	0.58
It would cause greater harm to the state's racial and ethnic populations	0.16	0.18	0.21	0.16	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.09	0.09	0.00	0.16	0	0.16	0	0.20	0.07	0.08	0.19	0.09	0.19
It would cause greater harm to low-income people	0.11	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.21	0.10	0.30	0.16	0.15	0.34	0.08	0	0.11	0	0.11	0.04	0.18	0.13	0.08	0.07
Recent criminal justice reforms already address the issues	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.09	0.12	0.08	0.04	0.05	0.06	0.02	0	0.06	0	0.05	0.09	0.08	0.05	0.08	0.05
Proposition 36 seeks to change other reasons	0.10	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.43	0.38	0.46	0.12	0.04	0.56	0.19	0	0.10	0	0.03	0.45	0.06	0.05	0.24	0.09
Can't specify	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.13	0.24	0.05	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0	0.03	0	0.02	0.05	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.02

Table 26: Q21 California’s nonpartisan legislative analyst predicts that Proposition 36 will lead to more people going to jail, prison and mandatory drug treatment for theft and drug crimes. Which of the following best describes how you think this would affect homelessness and drug addiction in California? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Region										Urbanicity			Party Registration					Likely Voters	
		Los Angeles County	San Diego County	Orange County	Inland Empire	Central Coast	Central Valley (total)	Sacramento / North Valley	San Joaquin Valley	SF Bay Area	North Coast/Sier-ras	Urban	Sub-urban	Rural/na	Dem	Rep	NPP	Other	NPP / other	Likely	Not likely
unweighted n	3045.00	908.00	290.00	212.00	308.00	183.00	475.00	273.00	202.00	597.00	72.00	1258.00	1314.00	473.00	1493.00	1002.00	386.00	164.00	550.00	3045.00	0
weighted n	2822.00	700.00	248.00	243.00	320.00	167.00	501.00	288.00	212.00	582.00	61.00	1221.00	1198.00	403.00	1324.00	790.00	514.00	194.00	708.00	2822.00	0
It will help reduce homelessness and addiction by getting drug users off the streets	0.29	0.29	0.35	0.34	0.21	0.32	0.31	0.25	0.39	0.23	0.51	0.26	0.31	0.31	0.19	0.47	0.26	0.33	0.28	0.29	0
It won't affect homelessness, people are on the street because there's not enough affordable housing	0.17	0.18	0.16	0.19	0.19	0.07	0.16	0.13	0.20	0.16	0.17	0.16	0.18	0.15	0.20	0.11	0.16	0.13	0.16	0.17	0
It will help reduce the number of people addicted to drugs but won't impact homelessness	0.10	0.08	0.12	0.17	0.15	0.09	0.07	0.06	0.08	0.11	0.02	0.13	0.10	0.06	0.11	0.12	0.09	0.05	0.08	0.10	0
It won't reduce drug addiction, it will just criminalize people with substance abuse problems	0.25	0.29	0.20	0.16	0.20	0.24	0.27	0.35	0.16	0.29	0.20	0.29	0.22	0.24	0.31	0.12	0.27	0.34	0.29	0.25	0
Don't know	0.19	0.15	0.18	0.13	0.24	0.28	0.19	0.21	0.16	0.21	0.09	0.17	0.19	0.23	0.19	0.18	0.21	0.16	0.19	0.19	0

Table 27: Q21 California’s nonpartisan legislative analyst predicts that Proposition 36 will lead to more people going to jail, prison and mandatory drug treatment for theft and drug crimes. Which of the following best describes how you think this would affect homelessness and drug addiction in California? (Likely Voters)

	Gender		Age							Race / Ethnicity							Nativity		
	Total	Male	Female	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+ (net)	65-74	75	White non- Hispanic	Latino (net)	Spanish domi- nant (Latino)	English domi- nant/ biling- ual (Latino)	Black	Asian/ Pac Isle	Amer In- dian/ Nati- ve Amer	US	Another coun- try
unweighted n	3045.00	1472.00	1572.00	247.00	299.00	417.00	968.00	1114.00	647.00	467.00	1721.00	677.00	170.00	493.00	270.00	264.00	63.00	2486.00	503.00
weighted n	2822.00	1332.00	1490.00	353.00	437.00	438.00	747.00	847.00	517.00	330.00	1495.00	711.00	188.00	508.00	151.00	391.00	61.00	2279.00	475.00
It will help reduce homelessness and addiction by getting drug users off the streets	0.29	0.36	0.23	0.18	0.27	0.32	0.32	0.30	0.31	0.28	0.30	0.32	0.31	0.32	0.18	0.19	0.31	0.28	0.29
It won't affect homelessness, people are on the street because there's not enough affordable housing	0.17	0.19	0.15	0.21	0.20	0.15	0.12	0.17	0.18	0.17	0.15	0.17	0.13	0.19	0.29	0.22	0.21	0.17	0.15
It will help reduce the number of people addicted to drugs but won't impact homelessness	0.10	0.07	0.13	0.06	0.09	0.07	0.14	0.11	0.13	0.09	0.07	0.15	0.26	0.11	0.04	0.12	0.11	0.09	0.19
It won't reduce drug addiction, it will just criminalize people with substance abuse problems	0.25	0.21	0.29	0.43	0.34	0.29	0.19	0.18	0.17	0.18	0.28	0.19	0.12	0.22	0.33	0.28	0.23	0.27	0.19
Don't know	0.19	0.18	0.20	0.12	0.09	0.16	0.24	0.24	0.22	0.27	0.20	0.17	0.19	0.16	0.17	0.20	0.13	0.19	0.18

Table 28: Q21 California’s nonpartisan legislative analyst predicts that Proposition 36 will lead to more people going to jail, prison and mandatory drug treatment for theft and drug crimes. Which of the following best describes how you think this would affect homelessness and drug addiction in California? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Political Ideology					Political Terms						Tenure		Union HH			
		Strongly con-servative	Somewhat con-servative	Moderate	Somewhat liberal	Strongly liberal	Libertarian	Progressive	Swifties	MAGA	Nationalist	Moms for Liberty	Evangelical Christian	Pro-choice	Owner	Renter / Other	Yes	No
unweighted n	3045.00	321.00	525.00	963.00	635.00	537.00	199.00	838.00	106.00	493.00	119.00	47.00	267.00	1411.00	1956.00	1089.00	759.00	2223.00
weighted n	2822.00	316.00	474.00	895.00	557.00	503.00	150.00	757.00	110.00	504.00	121.00	32.00	258.00	1252.00	1562.00	1260.00	646.00	2105.00
It will help reduce homelessness and addiction by getting drug users off the streets	0.29	0.45	0.48	0.32	0.17	0.06	0.53	0.13	0.19	0.53	0.59	0.43	0.35	0.19	0.34	0.23	0.29	0.28
It won't affect homelessness, people are on the street because there's not enough affordable housing	0.17	0.11	0.08	0.16	0.23	0.23	0.10	0.22	0.07	0.08	0.15	0.09	0.13	0.20	0.13	0.21	0.17	0.17
It will help reduce the number of people addicted to drugs but won't impact homelessness	0.10	0.16	0.09	0.12	0.09	0.06	0.09	0.09	0.13	0.12	0.14	0.01	0.17	0.08	0.10	0.11	0.12	0.10
It won't reduce drug addiction, it will just criminalize people with substance abuse problems	0.25	0.12	0.15	0.18	0.33	0.52	0.18	0.42	0.42	0.11	0.06	0.19	0.18	0.36	0.21	0.31	0.24	0.26
Don't know	0.19	0.16	0.20	0.21	0.19	0.12	0.09	0.15	0.20	0.16	0.06	0.28	0.17	0.17	0.22	0.15	0.19	0.19

Table 29: Q21 California’s nonpartisan legislative analyst predicts that Proposition 36 will lead to more people going to jail, prison and mandatory drug treatment for theft and drug crimes. Which of the following best describes how you think this would affect homelessness and drug addiction in California? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Education				Household Income						Marital Status			
		High school grad or less	Some college/trade school	College graduate (BA)	Post graduate education	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000-\$39,999	\$40,000-\$59,999	\$60,000-\$99,999	\$100,000-\$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Married	Not married/live together	Separated/divorced/widowed	Single/never married
unweighted n	3045.00	297.00	875.00	1004.00	856.00	157.00	239.00	319.00	581.00	1008.00	589.00	1683.00	196.00	540.00	556.00
weighted n	2822.00	396.00	1077.00	842.00	497.00	246.00	285.00	325.00	567.00	847.00	421.00	1439.00	237.00	444.00	632.00
It will help reduce homelessness and addiction by getting drug users off the streets	0.29	0.29	0.32	0.27	0.25	0.19	0.25	0.18	0.30	0.32	0.36	0.32	0.28	0.29	0.20
It won't affect homelessness, people are on the street because there's not enough affordable housing	0.17	0.20	0.14	0.17	0.19	0.16	0.20	0.19	0.18	0.17	0.11	0.15	0.29	0.15	0.18
It will help reduce the number of people addicted to drugs but won't impact homelessness	0.10	0.12	0.11	0.10	0.10	0.06	0.12	0.16	0.11	0.09	0.06	0.13	0.06	0.09	0.08
It won't reduce drug addiction, it will just criminalize people with substance abuse problems	0.25	0.22	0.25	0.29	0.24	0.48	0.23	0.20	0.26	0.22	0.29	0.21	0.23	0.22	0.40
Don't know	0.19	0.17	0.19	0.17	0.22	0.10	0.21	0.27	0.15	0.20	0.18	0.20	0.13	0.25	0.14

Table 30: Q21 California’s nonpartisan legislative analyst predicts that Proposition 36 will lead to more people going to jail, prison and mandatory drug treatment for theft and drug crimes. Which of the following best describes how you think this would affect homelessness and drug addiction in California? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Party ID									Vote on Prop. 36			Vote on Prop. 32			Vote on Prop. 33			
		Democrat (net)	Strong Democrat	Not strong Democrat	Republican (net)	Strong Republican	Not strong Republican	Independent/other (net)	Democrat	Lean Republican	Pure Independent/other	Yes voters	No voters	Undecided voters	Yes voters	No voters	Undecided voters	Yes voters	No voters	Undecided voters
unweighted n	3045.00	1731.00	998.00	733.00	1054.00	488.00	564.00	913.00	401.00	310.00	202.00	1864.00	593.00	584.00	1392.00	1163.00	488.00	1054.00	1222.00	767.00
weighted n	2822.00	1578.00	817.00	762.00	990.00	464.00	525.00	873.00	397.00	288.00	188.00	1689.00	582.00	549.00	1294.00	1013.00	509.00	1052.00	1017.00	754.00
It will help reduce homelessness and addiction by getting drug users off the streets	0.29	0.17	0.16	0.17	0.47	0.51	0.44	0.28	0.13	0.47	0.28	0.45	0.03	0.08	0.18	0.48	0.17	0.21	0.43	0.20
It won't affect homelessness, people are on the street because there's not enough affordable housing	0.17	0.21	0.19	0.22	0.10	0.11	0.09	0.18	0.22	0.14	0.17	0.17	0.21	0.11	0.24	0.10	0.11	0.24	0.12	0.13
It will help reduce the number of people addicted to drugs but won't impact homelessness	0.10	0.09	0.11	0.07	0.13	0.09	0.17	0.08	0.06	0.10	0.09	0.15	0.02	0.06	0.09	0.12	0.11	0.12	0.12	0.07
It won't reduce drug addiction, it will just criminalize people with substance abuse problems	0.25	0.36	0.34	0.37	0.12	0.10	0.14	0.27	0.42	0.14	0.17	0.10	0.67	0.29	0.35	0.14	0.23	0.33	0.19	0.24
Don't know	0.19	0.18	0.20	0.16	0.17	0.19	0.16	0.19	0.17	0.15	0.29	0.14	0.08	0.47	0.14	0.15	0.38	0.11	0.14	0.36

Table 31: Q22 Which of the following best describes your opinion of the most important aspect of the criminal justice system that needs improving? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Region										Urbanicity			Party Registration					Likely Voters	
		Los Angeles County	San Diego County	Orange County	Inland Empire	Central Coast	Central Valley (total)	Sacramento / North Valley	San Joaquin Valley	SF Bay Area	North Coast/Sier-ras	Urban	Sub-urban	Rural/na	Dem	Rep	NPP	Other	NPP / other	Likely	Not likely
unweighted n	3045.00	908.00	290.00	212.00	308.00	183.00	475.00	273.00	202.00	597.00	72.00	1258.00	1314.00	473.00	1493.00	1002.00	386.00	164.00	550.00	3045.00	0
weighted n	2822.00	700.00	248.00	243.00	320.00	167.00	501.00	288.00	212.00	582.00	61.00	1221.00	1198.00	403.00	1324.00	790.00	514.00	194.00	708.00	2822.00	0
We need to expand efforts to provide first time offenders with rehabilitation and treatment	0.39	0.37	0.34	0.31	0.32	0.39	0.42	0.51	0.28	0.49	0.42	0.42	0.38	0.33	0.53	0.13	0.42	0.41	0.42	0.39	0
People who repeatedly break the law should get longer prison sentences	0.27	0.28	0.35	0.36	0.29	0.24	0.27	0.17	0.40	0.21	0.28	0.25	0.28	0.32	0.21	0.39	0.30	0.22	0.27	0.27	0
More people who break the law should be prosecuted	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.27	0.17	0.23	0.23	0.21	0.25	0.17	0.18	0.19	0.21	0.22	0.11	0.39	0.16	0.19	0.17	0.20	0
Something else	0.08	0.09	0.02	0.04	0.14	0.06	0.06	0.08	0.04	0.07	0.10	0.09	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.12	0.08	0.08	0
Don't know	0.06	0.06	0.10	0.03	0.07	0.08	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.07	0.02	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.07	0.03	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0

Table 32: Q22 Which of the following best describes your opinion of the most important aspect of the criminal justice system that needs improving? (Likely Voters)

	Gender			Age							Race / Ethnicity							Nativity	
	Total	Male	Female	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+ (net)	65-74	75	White non- Hispanic	Latino (net)	Spanish domi- nant (Latino)	English domi- nant/ biling- ual (Latino)	Black	Asian/ Pac Isle	Amer In- dian/ Na- tive Amer	US	Another coun- try
unweighted n	3045.00	1472.00	1572.00	247.00	299.00	417.00	968.00	1114.00	647.00	467.00	1721.00	677.00	170.00	493.00	270.00	264.00	63.00	2486.00	503.00
weighted n	2822.00	1332.00	1490.00	353.00	437.00	438.00	747.00	847.00	517.00	330.00	1495.00	711.00	188.00	508.00	151.00	391.00	61.00	2279.00	475.00
We need to expand efforts to provide first time offenders with rehabilitation and treatment	0.39	0.34	0.44	0.59	0.42	0.37	0.30	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.42	0.35	0.23	0.40	0.48	0.38	0.46	0.42	0.30
People who repeatedly break the law should get longer prison sentences	0.27	0.30	0.25	0.16	0.30	0.29	0.30	0.28	0.27	0.30	0.25	0.35	0.49	0.30	0.20	0.28	0.17	0.25	0.40
More people who break the law should be prosecuted	0.20	0.24	0.16	0.12	0.18	0.17	0.24	0.23	0.22	0.24	0.23	0.17	0.13	0.18	0.09	0.16	0.21	0.20	0.19
Something else	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.11	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.05	0.07	0.07	0.09	0.07	0.14	0.07	0.11	0.08	0.06
Don't know	0.06	0.04	0.07	0.06	0.03	0.07	0.07	0.05	0.06	0.03	0.04	0.06	0.07	0.05	0.08	0.11	0.05	0.06	0.05

Table 33: Q22 Which of the following best describes your opinion of the most important aspect of the criminal justice system that needs improving? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Political Ideology					Political Terms						Tenure		Union HH			
		Strongly conservative	Somewhat conservative	Moderate	Somewhat liberal	Strongly liberal	Libertarian	Progressive	Swifties	MAGA	Nationalist	Moms for Liberty	Evangelical Christian	Pro-choice	Owner	Renter / Other	Yes	No
unweighted n	3045.00	321.00	525.00	963.00	635.00	537.00	199.00	838.00	106.00	493.00	119.00	47.00	267.00	1411.00	1956.00	1089.00	759.00	2223.00
weighted n	2822.00	316.00	474.00	895.00	557.00	503.00	150.00	757.00	110.00	504.00	121.00	32.00	258.00	1252.00	1562.00	1260.00	646.00	2105.00
We need to expand efforts to provide first time offenders with rehabilitation and treatment	0.39	0.14	0.15	0.35	0.53	0.74	0.34	0.62	0.54	0.16	0.25	0.36	0.25	0.58	0.35	0.45	0.37	0.41
People who repeatedly break the law should get longer prison sentences	0.27	0.36	0.44	0.31	0.18	0.10	0.25	0.14	0.21	0.44	0.41	0.28	0.39	0.19	0.28	0.27	0.30	0.26
More people who break the law should be prosecuted	0.20	0.39	0.30	0.20	0.16	0.04	0.35	0.09	0.04	0.35	0.30	0.24	0.23	0.12	0.23	0.16	0.19	0.20
Something else	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.06	0.08	0.10	0.05	0.12	0.06	0.05	0.02	0.12	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.08
Don't know	0.06	0.04	0.03	0.08	0.06	0.03	0.01	0.04	0.15	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.05	0.07	0.05

Table 34: Q22 Which of the following best describes your opinion of the most important aspect of the criminal justice system that needs improving? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Education				Household Income						Marital Status			
		High school grad or less	Some college/trade school	College graduate (BA)	Post graduate education	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000-\$39,999	\$40,000-\$59,999	\$60,000-\$99,999	\$100,000-\$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Married	Not married/live together	Separated/divorced/widowed	Single/never married
unweighted n	3045.00	297.00	875.00	1004.00	856.00	157.00	239.00	319.00	581.00	1008.00	589.00	1683.00	196.00	540.00	556.00
weighted n	2822.00	396.00	1077.00	842.00	497.00	246.00	285.00	325.00	567.00	847.00	421.00	1439.00	237.00	444.00	632.00
We need to expand efforts to provide first time offenders with rehabilitation and treatment	0.39	0.40	0.30	0.46	0.47	0.54	0.36	0.44	0.37	0.38	0.38	0.36	0.32	0.36	0.53
People who repeatedly break the law should get longer prison sentences	0.27	0.30	0.33	0.22	0.23	0.16	0.29	0.22	0.34	0.29	0.23	0.29	0.27	0.30	0.22
More people who break the law should be prosecuted	0.20	0.15	0.23	0.20	0.18	0.12	0.22	0.15	0.18	0.22	0.25	0.22	0.19	0.24	0.13
Something else	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.05	0.08	0.15	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.08	0.07	0.17	0.07	0.07
Don't know	0.06	0.07	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.03	0.06	0.11	0.03	0.05	0.07	0.07	0.05	0.02	0.06

Table 35: Q22 Which of the following best describes your opinion of the most important aspect of the criminal justice system that needs improving? (Likely Voters)

	Total	Party ID										Vote on Prop. 36			Vote on Prop. 32			Vote on Prop. 33		
		Democrat (net)	Strong Democrat	Not strong Democrat	Republican (net)	Strong Republican	Not strong Republican	Independent/other (net)	Democrat	Lean Republican	Pure Independent/other	Yes voters	No voters	Undecided voters	Yes voters	No voters	Undecided voters	Yes voters	No voters	Undecided voters
unweighted n	3045.00	1731.00	998.00	733.00	1054.00	488.00	564.00	913.00	401.00	310.00	202.00	1864.00	593.00	584.00	1392.00	1163.00	488.00	1054.00	1222.00	767.00
weighted n	2822.00	1578.00	817.00	762.00	990.00	464.00	525.00	873.00	397.00	288.00	188.00	1689.00	582.00	549.00	1294.00	1013.00	509.00	1052.00	1017.00	754.00
We need to expand efforts to provide first time offenders with rehabilitation and treatment	0.39	0.56	0.59	0.53	0.15	0.11	0.19	0.39	0.59	0.18	0.27	0.26	0.70	0.46	0.56	0.19	0.37	0.52	0.23	0.42
People who repeatedly break the law should get longer prison sentences	0.27	0.19	0.16	0.22	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.26	0.17	0.37	0.25	0.39	0.07	0.14	0.21	0.38	0.23	0.26	0.34	0.21
More people who break the law should be prosecuted	0.20	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.35	0.41	0.30	0.19	0.11	0.32	0.18	0.28	0.05	0.12	0.11	0.34	0.17	0.10	0.33	0.17
Something else	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.05	0.08	0.10	0.08	0.12	0.12	0.05	0.16	0.06	0.08	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.07	0.07
Don't know	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.06	0.05	0.01	0.18	0.03	0.01	0.21	0.04	0.03	0.15	0.03	0.03	0.14