

FIELD

RESEARCH

CORPORATION

FOUNDED IN 1945 BY MERVIN FIELD

601 California Street, Suite 900 • San Francisco, California 94108 • 415-392-5763

**Tabulations From a Survey of Likely Voter Preferences Regarding
Proposition 93, the Term Limits Initiative, and Four Referenda on Indian
Gaming on California's February 5th Primary Election Ballot**

*- prepared for -
Capitol Alert*

December 2007

Introduction

This volume presents the statistical data developed from a *Field Poll* survey of likely voters preferences regarding Proposition 93, the Term Limits initiative, and four referenda on Indian gaming that will appear on California's February 5th primary election ballot. *The Field Poll* is an independent and non-partisan survey of public opinion in California established in 1945 by Mervin Field. Reports of *The Field Poll*, typically published 30-50 times per year, cover a wide range of political, and political topics. Many of California's leading media properties and news organizations publish and broadcast the results of each *Field Poll* report as feature or breaking news stories in their respective publications and broadcasts. All new and previous reports since 1995 are available to the public through its online archives at www.field.com/fieldpollonline. *The Field Poll* is owned and operated by Field Research Corporation, with headquarters in San Francisco, California.

The results contained in this report are based on a *Field Poll* survey completed among a representative sample of 1,283 registered voters statewide, of whom 866 were considered likely voters in the February 5th primary election. All interviewing was conducted during the period December 10-17, 2007 by telephone.

Sample Frame

Voters in the survey were selected randomly from a listing of California's statewide voter registration rolls. The list used by Field provides a telephone number for over 90% of the state's registered voters. These telephone numbers come from a variety of sources, including telephone numbers included by the voter on the his/her official voter registration form, as well as through cross-referencing voter names and addresses against recent telephone directories and other telephone matching services. While the telephone numbers are primarily landline telephone numbers, these phone listings also include cell phones, whenever a cell phone number is provided by the voter when registering or in other settings accessible through telephone matching services. Thus, cell phones are not systematically excluded from the sample frame. Special procedures were used in the survey when contacting voters on their cell phones to include them into the survey sample.

Data Collection

Prior to the start of data collection, professionally-trained telephone interviewers were briefed with regard to the survey's proper calling and interviewing procedures by the Study Director. This session provided both interviewers and supervisors with an overview of the study and includes a question-by-question review of all items in the survey.

Interviewers then completed all survey interviews by telephone through the computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) system. CATI controls the telephone scripts read to individual respondents by displaying the appropriate questionnaire items and their valid response code alternatives in their proper sequence on computer screens at each interviewer's booth. The interviewer then reads each question aloud to the respondent from the screen and enters each respondent's pre-coded answer category through the keyboard directly to a computer disk. All answers are automatically stored in computer memory.

In order to bring hard-to-reach respondents into the survey, up to eight attempts (an initial call plus seven callbacks) were made to each telephone number selected for inclusion into the sample. Callbacks were made at different times and on different days to increase the probability of finding adults available for the interview. Where possible, appointments are made at specified dates and times to maximize convenience and cooperation rates.

Data Processing

Because CATI itself provides for the direct data entry of responses by the interviewer and does not permit ineligible or invalid data entries, the data file resulting from CATI interviewing is itself virtually error-free.

Following this, a final series of data checks were performed by means of a specially designed cleaning program that scrutinizes each respondent record for internally inconsistent information. Once the data were determined to be clean and error-free, the sample was weighted to align it to known estimates of the demographic and regional characteristics of the state's registered voter population.

Guide to Reading the Tables

The following is an explanation of the detailed statistical tabulations contained in this report:

- The question or questions upon which the data are based is shown at the top of each table
- Tables are percentaged vertically with the raw percentage base appearing at the top of each column.
- The data have been weighted to known parameters of the statewide registered voter population. All percentages and frequencies reported in each table are therefore weighted tabulations.
- In instances where percentages are calculated on small bases (e.g., when the unweighted base is fewer than 100 respondents) the reader is urged to interpret the data with caution, since results are subject to relatively large levels of sampling error.
- Throughout the tables an asterisk is used to denote a value of less than 1/2 of 1%. A hyphen indicates zero value. On some tables the percentages may add to more than 100% due to multiple mentions.
- Bases of subgroups used in the tabulations may add to less than the total number of respondents due to some respondents not reporting that characteristic.

Subgroup Definitions

The following are some of the definitions applicable to some of the voter subgroups reported in this volume:

Area

Southern California: Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, Imperial, Santa Barbara, Ventura, Kern, and San Luis Obispo counties

Northern California: all other 48 California counties

Coastal Counties: San Diego, Orange, Los Angeles, Ventura, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, Monterey, Santa Cruz, San Mateo, San Francisco, Contra Costa, Alameda, Marin, Napa, Solano, Sonoma, Santa Clara, Mendocino, Humboldt and Del Norte counties

Inland counties: all other 38 California counties

Region

Los Angeles: Los Angeles County

San Diego/Orange: San Diego and Orange counties

Other South: San Bernardino, Riverside, Imperial, Ventura, Santa Barbara, and San Luis Obispo

Central Valley: Butte, Colusa, Fresno, Glenn, Kern, Kings, Madera, Merced, Placer, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Shasta, Stanislaus, Sutter, Tehama, Tulare, Yolo, and Yuba

SF Bay Area: San Francisco, Marin, Napa, Sonoma, Solano, Contra Costa, Alameda, Santa Clara and San Mateo

Other North: Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Del Norte, El Dorado, Humboldt, Inyo, Lake, Lassen, Mariposa, Mendocino, Monterey, Modoc, Mono, Nevada, Plumas, San Benito, Santa Cruz, Sierra, Siskiyou, Trinity, and Tuolumne

All other subgroups are based on demographic variables or are derived from questions asked in the survey.

Estimates of Sampling Error

In any survey based on a sampling, there is some sampling error introduced into the data by the process of sampling itself. When the sample has been drawn using random processes, it is possible to apply probability principles to determine the potential range of such error. While survey samples of human populations rarely, if ever, meet all of the criteria theoretically required for the application of these principles, it is customary to use them as an approximation of error that is introduced as a result of sampling. The table below shows the range of error that is associated with samples of various sizes, assuming the use of the 95% confidence level, which is customary for most public opinion surveys.

For example, if 50% of a sample of overall sample of 866 likely voters in the California Democratic primary for president answered “yes” to a specific question, this statistic would have a sampling error of plus or minus 3.4 percentage points at the 95% confidence level. This means that there is a 95% chance that had the entire population of registered voters statewide been interviewed using the same questionnaire and methods, the results of such a census would yield a result between 46.6% and 53.4%. The same procedure can be used to estimate the sample error ranges of any other statistic contained in this report.

<u>Approximate sample size</u>	<u>Approximate percentage distribution of replies to question</u>				
	<u>10%</u>	<u>30%</u>	<u>50%</u>	<u>70%</u>	<u>90%</u>
100	+/- 6.0	+/- 9.2	+/- 10.0	+/- 9.2	+/- 6.0
200	+/- 4.3	+/- 6.5	+/- 7.1	+/- 6.5	+/- 4.3
300	+/- 3.5	+/- 5.3	+/- 5.8	+/- 5.3	+/- 3.5
500	+/- 2.7	+/- 4.1	+/- 4.5	+/- 4.1	+/- 2.7
866	+/- 2.0	+/- 3.1	+/- 3.4	+/- 3.1	+/- 2.0

There are many other possible sources of error other than sampling variability in this and any other public opinion survey. Different results could occur because of differences in question wording, sequencing, the rigor with which sampling procedures were implemented, or through undetected errors or omissions in sampling, interviewing or data processing. The Field professionals working on this study did everything possible to minimize such errors.

Questions Asked

(ASKED OF LIKELY VOTERS IN THE CALIFORNIA FEBRUARY 5TH PRIMARY ELECTION)

Have you seen, read or heard anything about Proposition 93, a statewide ballot proposition having to do with term limits that will appear on the February 2008 primary election ballot?

(As you know) Proposition 93 is called the "Limits on Legislators' Terms in Office" initiative. It reduces the total amount of time a person may serve in the state legislature from 14 years to 12 years and allows a person to serve a total of 12 years either in the Assembly, the Senate or a combination of both. It provides a transition period to allow current members to serve a total of 12 consecutive years in the house in which they are currently serving, regardless of any prior service in another house. If the election were being held today, would you vote Yes or No on Proposition 93?

As you know, the state of California allows legal casino gaming, such as playing slot machines, dice, blackjack, and roulette, at casinos located on Indian tribal lands. Tax proceeds from these casinos are shared between the state government and the local governments where they are located. In general, do you favor or oppose expanding the number of casino gaming establishments on Indian tribal lands in California?

Have you seen, read or heard anything about four separate referendums to ratify amendments to four Indian gaming compacts that will appear on California's February primary election ballot as Propositions 94-97?

As you know) these referendum are amendments to four Indian Gaming compacts. A "Yes" vote on each approves and a "No" vote rejects a law that ratifies an amendment to existing gaming compacts between the state and four Southern California Indian tribes. Fiscal impact: Net increase in annual state revenues from each referendum probably in the tens of millions of dollars, growing over time through the year 2030. If the election were being held today, would you vote Yes or No on Propositions 94 through 97?

Tabulations

Table 58-1

Q.28: HAVE YOU SEEN, READ OR HEARD ANYTHING ABOUT PROPOSITION 93, A STATEWIDE
 BALLOT PROPOSITION HAVING TO DO WITH TERM LIMITS THAT WILL APPEAR ON THE FEBRUARY 2008
 PRIMARY ELECTION BALLOT?
 BASED TO LIKELY VOTERS IN THE FEBRUARY PRIMARY ELECTION

	===== REGION=====												PARTY			LIKELIHOOD		VOTING METHOD		
	COUNTIES												REGISTRATION			OF VOTING		=====		
TOTAL	=====												=====			=====		TOTAL PERM.		
REG	SO.	NO.	COS-	IN-	AREA								NON-	FEB.	NOV.	PRE-	ABS-	ABS-		
VOTER	CA.	CA.	TAL	LAND	LOS	SAN	OTHER	CNTRL	S.F.	OTHER	DEM-	REPUB	PART/	PRI-	GENRL	CINT	TEE	TEE		
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
BASE: LIKELY VOTERS IN FEB. PRIM. ELECTION																				
WEIGHTED BASE	866	507	359	635	231	216	76	80	116	146	190	43	399	322	145	866	839	460	397	276
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
YES	216	110	106	147	69	40	23	11	29	48	55	9	95	81	40	216	213	104	108	79
	24.9%	21.6%	29.5%	23.2%	29.7%	18.3%	30.2%	14.2%	24.8%	33.1%	29.1%	21.8%	23.8%	25.1%	27.5%	24.9%	25.4%	22.6%	27.1%	28.7%
NO	634	390	244	472	161	171	53	67	87	97	127	32	296	236	101	634	610	348	280	191
	73.2%	76.9%	67.9%	74.4%	69.8%	79.0%	69.8%	84.0%	74.7%	66.5%	66.9%	76.1%	74.3%	73.3%	69.9%	73.2%	72.7%	75.7%	70.6%	69.3%
NO OPINION	17	8	9	16	1	6	-	1	1	1	8	1	8	5	4	17	16	8	9	6
	1.9%	1.5%	2.5%	2.4%	0.6%	2.6%		1.8%	0.5%	0.5%	4.0%	2.1%	2.0%	1.6%	2.6%	1.9%	1.9%	1.7%	2.3%	2.1%

Table 58-2

Q.28: HAVE YOU SEEN, READ OR HEARD ANYTHING ABOUT PROPOSITION 93, A STATEWIDE
 BALLOT PROPOSITION HAVING TO DO WITH TERM LIMITS THAT WILL APPEAR ON THE FEBRUARY 2008
 PRIMARY ELECTION BALLOT?
 BASED TO LIKELY VOTERS IN THE FEBRUARY PRIMARY ELECTION

TOTAL REG VOTER	GENDER		AGE					ETHNICITY					POLITICAL IDEOLOGY					MARITAL STATUS		
	MALE	FEM	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65 PLUS	WHITE NON- HISPN	LA- TINO	BLACK	ASIAN /OTHR	CONSERVATV STRNG CNSRV	MDDLE MODER CNSRV	LIBERAL THE LIBRL	LIBERAL MODER LIBRL	STRNG LIBRL	MRRD/ LIVE TOGTH	SEPRT DVRG/ WIDOW	NEVER MARRD	
WEIGHTED BASE	866	384	483	84	131	187	269	195	609	176	36	52	179	89	379	93	126	582	131	144
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
YES	216	103	113	7	19	45	84	61	164	29	11	14	48	21	96	20	31	154	38	21
	24.9%	26.8%	23.4%	8.7%	14.1%	24.1%	31.1%	31.4%	27.0%	16.6%	29.1%	27.6%	26.8%	23.8%	25.3%	21.1%	24.6%	26.5%	28.9%	14.8%
NO	634	277	357	77	110	135	183	130	435	140	25	38	127	68	275	71	94	415	90	121
	73.2%	72.1%	74.0%	91.3%	83.4%	72.0%	68.2%	66.5%	71.4%	79.9%	68.6%	72.4%	70.8%	76.2%	72.5%	75.8%	74.6%	71.4%	68.9%	83.8%
NO OPINION	17	4	13	-	3	7	2	4	10	6	1	-	4	-	9	3	1	12	3	2
	1.9%	1.1%	2.6%		2.5%	3.9%	0.8%	2.2%	1.6%	3.5%	2.3%		2.4%		2.3%	3.2%	0.8%	2.1%	2.2%	1.3%

Table 58-3

Q.28: HAVE YOU SEEN, READ OR HEARD ANYTHING ABOUT PROPOSITION 93, A STATEWIDE
 BALLOT PROPOSITION HAVING TO DO WITH TERM LIMITS THAT WILL APPEAR ON THE FEBRUARY 2008
 PRIMARY ELECTION BALLOT?
 BASED TO LIKELY VOTERS IN THE FEBRUARY PRIMARY ELECTION

	EDUCATION					HOUSEHOLD INCOME				RELIGION				BRN AGAIN		TENURE		UNION	
	TOTAL REG VOTER	H.S. GRAD/ LESS	SOME CLLG/ TRADE	COLLG GRAD	POST GRAD WORK	UNDR \$20K	\$20K \$39K	\$40K \$79K	\$80K PLUS	PROTS/ CHRSTN	CATH- OLIC	OTHER RELIG	NO PREF	CHRISTIAN YES	NO NO	HOME OWNER	RENTN RENTN	YES	NO
BASE: LIKELY VOTERS IN FEB. PRIM. ELECTION	866	191	300	223	145	69	137	211	319	320	202	141	168	184	674	665	176	228	626
WEIGHTED BASE	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
YES	216	37	76	54	47	13	32	56	80	80	52	40	37	41	170	186	28	56	157
	24.9%	19.5%	25.2%	24.3%	32.7%	18.5%	23.6%	26.7%	24.9%	25.0%	25.6%	28.7%	21.7%	22.3%	25.3%	28.0%	15.7%	24.6%	25.1%
NO	634	153	217	162	97	55	102	152	231	235	148	93	129	141	489	464	146	166	458
	73.2%	79.8%	72.3%	72.6%	66.5%	79.4%	74.4%	72.3%	72.4%	73.5%	73.3%	66.3%	76.8%	76.4%	72.6%	69.9%	82.7%	72.8%	73.2%
NO OPINION	17	1	7	7	1	1	3	2	9	5	2	7	3	3	14	14	3	6	11
	1.9%	0.7%	2.5%	3.1%	0.8%	2.0%	2.0%	1.0%	2.7%	1.5%	1.1%	5.0%	1.6%	1.4%	2.1%	2.1%	1.6%	2.6%	1.7%

Table 59-1

Q.29: (AS YOU KNOW) PROPOSITION 93 IS CALLED THE "LIMITS ON LEGISLATORS' TERMS IN OFFICE" INITIATIVE. IT REDUCES THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF TIME A PERSON MAY SERVE IN THE STATE LEGISLATURE FROM 14 YEARS TO 12 YEARS AND ALLOWS A PERSON TO SERVE A TOTAL OF 12 YEARS EITHER IN THE ASSEMBLY, THE SENATE OR A COMBINATION OF BOTH. IT PROVIDES A TRANSITION PERIOD TO ALLOW CURRENT MEMBERS TO SERVE A TOTAL OF 12 CONSECUTIVE YEARS IN THE HOUSE IN WHICH THEY ARE CURRENTLY SERVING, REGARDLESS OF ANY PRIOR SERVICE IN ANOTHER HOUSE. IF THE ELECTION WERE BEING HELD TODAY, WOULD YOU VOTE YES OR NO ON PROPOSITION 93? BASED TO LIKELY VOTERS IN THE FEBRUARY PRIMARY ELECTION

TOTAL REG VOTER	===== REGION=====												PARTY REGISTRATION			LIKELIHOOD OF VOTING			VOTING METHOD		
	COUNTIES						AREA						NON-			TOTAL PERM.					
	SO. CA.	NO. CA.	TAL CNTY	IN- CNTY	LAND	LOS ANGLS	SAN DIEGO	ORANG	SOUTH	CNTRL VALLY	S.F. BAY	OTHER NORTH	DEMO- CRAT	RE PUB LICAN	PART/ OTHER	FEB. MARY	NOV. ELECN	PRE- CINT	ABS N- TEE	ABS N- TEE	
BASE: LIKELY VOTERS IN FEB. PRIM. ELECTION																					
WEIGHTED BASE	866	507	359	635	231	216	76	80	116	146	190	43	399	322	145	866	839	460	397	276	
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
YES	436	269	167	305	131	107	40	43	66	80	78	22	188	180	68	436	423	230	203	139	
	50.3%	53.0%	46.6%	48.0%	56.6%	49.6%	52.5%	53.9%	57.2%	54.9%	41.1%	50.8%	47.0%	55.9%	47.2%	50.3%	50.4%	50.0%	51.2%	50.5%	
NO	277	148	129	211	66	59	25	23	38	42	79	11	148	93	36	277	269	147	126	88	
	31.9%	29.1%	35.9%	33.2%	28.5%	27.3%	33.2%	28.3%	32.9%	28.6%	41.5%	26.6%	37.1%	28.7%	24.9%	31.9%	32.0%	32.0%	31.8%	31.8%	
NO OPINION	154	91	63	119	34	50	11	14	12	24	33	10	63	50	40	154	148	83	68	49	
	17.7%	17.9%	17.5%	18.8%	14.9%	23.2%	14.3%	17.8%	10.0%	16.5%	17.5%	22.6%	15.9%	15.4%	27.9%	17.7%	17.6%	18.1%	17.0%	17.7%	

Table 59-2

Q.29: (AS YOU KNOW) PROPOSITION 93 IS CALLED THE "LIMITS ON LEGISLATORS' TERMS IN OFFICE" INITIATIVE. IT REDUCES THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF TIME A PERSON MAY SERVE IN THE STATE LEGISLATURE FROM 14 YEARS TO 12 YEARS AND ALLOWS A PERSON TO SERVE A TOTAL OF 12 YEARS EITHER IN THE ASSEMBLY, THE SENATE OR A COMBINATION OF BOTH. IT PROVIDES A TRANSITION PERIOD TO ALLOW CURRENT MEMBERS TO SERVE A TOTAL OF 12 CONSECUTIVE YEARS IN THE HOUSE IN WHICH THEY ARE CURRENTLY SERVING, REGARDLESS OF ANY PRIOR SERVICE IN ANOTHER HOUSE. IF THE ELECTION WERE BEING HELD TODAY, WOULD YOU VOTE YES OR NO ON PROPOSITION 93? BASED TO LIKELY VOTERS IN THE FEBRUARY PRIMARY ELECTION

TOTAL REG VOTER	GENDER		AGE					ETHNICITY					POLITICAL IDEOLOGY					MARITAL STATUS		
	MALE	FEM	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65 PLUS	WHITE HISPN	NON- TINO	LA- BLACK	ASIAN /OTHR	CONSERVATV CNSRV	MDDLE MODER	LIBERAL ROAD	LIBERAL LIBRL	LIBERAL LIBRL	MRRD/ TOGTH	SEPRT WIDOW	NEVER MARRD	
866	384	483	84	131	187	269	195	609	176	36	52	179	89	379	93	126	582	131	144	
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
436	185	251	42	65	96	142	91	306	89	16	28	103	44	196	46	47	283	63	85	
50.3%	48.2%	52.0%	50.0%	49.7%	51.6%	52.7%	46.5%	50.3%	50.6%	44.9%	53.3%	57.3%	49.9%	51.7%	49.8%	36.9%	48.7%	48.5%	58.8%	
277	143	134	27	42	59	87	61	196	53	11	19	47	28	119	34	49	190	39	45	
31.9%	37.3%	27.7%	32.1%	32.1%	31.7%	32.3%	31.4%	32.2%	30.5%	31.6%	36.7%	26.2%	31.5%	31.2%	36.4%	39.1%	32.7%	29.5%	31.3%	
154	56	98	15	24	31	40	43	107	33	9	5	30	16	65	13	30	108	29	14	
17.7%	14.5%	20.3%	17.9%	18.2%	16.8%	14.9%	22.1%	17.5%	18.9%	23.5%	10.0%	16.5%	18.5%	17.0%	13.8%	24.0%	18.6%	22.0%	9.9%	

BASE: LIKELY VOTERS IN
FEB. PRIM. ELECTION

WEIGHTED BASE

YES

NO

NO OPINION

Table 59-3

Q.29: (AS YOU KNOW) PROPOSITION 93 IS CALLED THE "LIMITS ON LEGISLATORS' TERMS IN OFFICE" INITIATIVE. IT REDUCES THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF TIME A PERSON MAY SERVE IN THE STATE LEGISLATURE FROM 14 YEARS TO 12 YEARS AND ALLOWS A PERSON TO SERVE A TOTAL OF 12 YEARS EITHER IN THE ASSEMBLY, THE SENATE OR A COMBINATION OF BOTH. IT PROVIDES A TRANSITION PERIOD TO ALLOW CURRENT MEMBERS TO SERVE A TOTAL OF 12 CONSECUTIVE YEARS IN THE HOUSE IN WHICH THEY ARE CURRENTLY SERVING, REGARDLESS OF ANY PRIOR SERVICE IN ANOTHER HOUSE. IF THE ELECTION WERE BEING HELD TODAY, WOULD YOU VOTE YES OR NO ON PROPOSITION 93? BASED TO LIKELY VOTERS IN THE FEBRUARY PRIMARY ELECTION

	EDUCATION					HOUSEHOLD INCOME				RELIGION				BRN AGAIN		TENURE		UNION	
	TOTAL	H.S. REG	SOME GRAD/ LESS	POST COLLG GRAD	POST GRAD WORK	UNDR \$20K	\$20K \$39K	\$40K \$79K	\$80K PLUS	PROTS/ CHRSTN	CATH- OLIC	OTHER RELIG	NO PREF	CHRISTIAN YES	CHRISTIAN NO	HOME OWNER	RENTR	AFFILIATED YES	AFFILIATED NO
BASE: LIKELY VOTERS IN FEB. PRIM. ELECTION																			
WEIGHTED BASE	866	191	300	223	145	69	137	211	319	320	202	141	168	184	674	665	176	228	626
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
YES	436	96	154	108	76	35	74	105	162	170	105	73	77	108	324	345	82	99	333
	50.3%	50.2%	51.3%	48.4%	52.0%	50.8%	54.4%	49.8%	51.0%	53.2%	51.8%	51.7%	45.5%	58.4%	48.2%	51.9%	46.5%	43.4%	53.1%
NO	277	58	96	73	48	17	40	75	105	93	66	45	55	55	220	215	52	91	183
	31.9%	30.5%	31.9%	32.8%	32.8%	25.3%	29.0%	35.3%	32.8%	28.9%	32.6%	32.3%	32.7%	29.6%	32.6%	32.3%	29.6%	39.8%	29.2%
NO OPINION	154	37	50	42	22	17	23	31	52	57	32	22	37	22	130	105	42	38	110
	17.7%	19.3%	16.8%	18.8%	15.1%	23.9%	16.6%	14.8%	16.2%	17.9%	15.6%	15.9%	21.8%	12.0%	19.2%	15.8%	23.9%	16.8%	17.6%

Table 61-1

Q.30: AS YOU KNOW, THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA ALLOWS LEGAL CASINO GAMING, SUCH AS PLAYING SLOT MACHINES, DICE, BLACKJACK, AND ROULETTE, AT CASINOS LOCATED ON INDIAN TRIBAL LANDS. TAX PROCEEDS FROM THESE CASINOS ARE SHARED BETWEEN THE STATE GOVERNMENT AND THE LOCAL GOVERNMENTS WHERE THEY ARE LOCATED. IN GENERAL, DO YOU FAVOR OR OPPOSE EXPANDING THE NUMBER OF CASINO GAMING ESTABLISHMENTS ON INDIAN TRIBAL LANDS IN CALIFORNIA?

BASED TO LIKELY VOTERS IN THE FEBRUARY PRIMARY ELECTION

	===== REGION=====												PARTY			LIKELIHOOD		VOTING METHOD																						
	COUNTIES												REGISTRATION			OF VOTING		=====																						
	TOTAL	REG	SO.	NO.	TAL	IN-	LOS	SAN	OTHER	CNTRL	S.F.	OTHER	DEMOCRAT	REPUBLICAN	NON-PART/OTHER	FEB. MARY	NOV. ELEC	PRE-CINT VOTER	ABSNT VOTER	PERM. TEE	ABSNT VOTER																			
BASE: LIKELY VOTERS IN FEB. PRIM. ELECTION	866	507	359	635	231	216	76	80	116	146	190	43	399	322	145	866	839	460	397	276	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		
WEIGHTED BASE	866	507	359	635	231	216	76	80	116	146	190	43	399	322	145	866	839	460	397	276	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%			
FAVOR	357	228	128	262	95	95	34	33	60	53	66	16	166	126	64	357	348	207	146	101	41.2%	45.0%	35.8%	41.3%	41.0%	44.1%	44.2%	41.3%	51.5%	36.2%	34.9%	38.3%	41.6%	39.2%	44.4%	41.2%	41.5%	45.1%	36.7%	36.6%
OPPOSE	389	209	180	286	103	87	30	38	45	72	98	18	174	153	62	389	380	193	193	133	44.9%	41.2%	50.2%	45.0%	44.5%	40.4%	39.6%	47.6%	39.0%	49.3%	51.8%	41.9%	43.7%	47.5%	42.5%	44.9%	45.2%	41.9%	48.5%	48.3%
DEPENDS	64	32	32	42	22	14	6	3	6	15	15	4	26	29	9	64	60	30	33	26	7.4%	6.3%	8.9%	6.7%	9.3%	6.6%	7.3%	3.9%	5.4%	10.5%	7.9%	10.5%	6.6%	8.9%	6.4%	7.4%	7.2%	6.6%	8.3%	9.4%
NO OPINION	57	38	18	45	12	19	7	6	5	6	10	4	33	14	10	57	51	30	26	16	6.5%	7.5%	5.1%	7.0%	5.2%	9.0%	8.9%	7.3%	4.1%	4.0%	5.4%	9.3%	8.2%	4.4%	6.8%	6.5%	6.1%	6.4%	6.6%	5.6%

Table 61-2

Q.30: AS YOU KNOW, THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA ALLOWS LEGAL CASINO GAMING, SUCH AS PLAYING SLOT MACHINES, DICE, BLACKJACK, AND ROULETTE, AT CASINOS LOCATED ON INDIAN TRIBAL LANDS. TAX PROCEEDS FROM THESE CASINOS ARE SHARED BETWEEN THE STATE GOVERNMENT AND THE LOCAL GOVERNMENTS WHERE THEY ARE LOCATED. IN GENERAL, DO YOU FAVOR OR OPPOSE EXPANDING THE NUMBER OF CASINO GAMING ESTABLISHMENTS ON INDIAN TRIBAL LANDS IN CALIFORNIA?

BASED TO LIKELY VOTERS IN THE FEBRUARY PRIMARY ELECTION

TOTAL REG VOTER	GENDER		AGE					ETHNICITY					POLITICAL IDEOLOGY					MARITAL STATUS		
	MALE	FEM	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65 PLUS	WHITE NON- HISPANIC	LA- TINO	BLACK	ASIAN /OTHER	CONSERVATIVE STRONG	MIDDLE MODERATE	LIBERAL	LIBERAL STRONG	MARRIED LIVE TOGETHER	SINGLE DIVORCED	NEVER MARRIED		
866	384	483	84	131	187	269	195	609	176	36	52	179	89	379	93	126	582	131	144	
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
FAVOR	357	167	189	36	68	76	107	70	241	78	20	18	56	33	173	36	59	216	62	76
	41.2%	43.7%	39.2%	42.7%	51.5%	40.5%	39.8%	36.0%	39.6%	44.2%	56.5%	35.4%	31.5%	37.4%	45.5%	38.6%	46.5%	37.1%	47.4%	52.7%
OPPOSE	389	162	227	35	49	84	122	99	283	70	13	28	94	39	162	43	51	273	57	54
	44.9%	42.2%	47.0%	41.5%	37.2%	45.1%	45.4%	50.6%	46.4%	39.8%	36.5%	53.4%	52.7%	44.4%	42.6%	45.7%	40.4%	47.0%	43.7%	37.3%
DEPENDS	64	33	31	3	5	15	27	14	51	8	2	4	18	9	23	6	9	52	8	4
	7.4%	8.7%	6.3%	3.3%	4.0%	8.1%	10.0%	7.1%	8.4%	4.8%	4.6%	6.9%	10.2%	9.7%	6.0%	6.0%	7.1%	8.9%	6.3%	2.8%
NO OPINION	57	21	36	11	10	12	13	12	34	20	1	2	10	8	22	9	8	41	3	10
	6.5%	5.4%	7.4%	12.5%	7.2%	6.3%	4.7%	6.3%	5.5%	11.3%	2.4%	4.3%	5.6%	8.5%	5.9%	9.7%	6.1%	7.0%	2.7%	7.2%

Table 61-3

Q.30: AS YOU KNOW, THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA ALLOWS LEGAL CASINO GAMING, SUCH AS PLAYING SLOT MACHINES, DICE, BLACKJACK, AND ROULETTE, AT CASINOS LOCATED ON INDIAN TRIBAL LANDS. TAX PROCEEDS FROM THESE CASINOS ARE SHARED BETWEEN THE STATE GOVERNMENT AND THE LOCAL GOVERNMENTS WHERE THEY ARE LOCATED. IN GENERAL, DO YOU FAVOR OR OPPOSE EXPANDING THE NUMBER OF CASINO GAMING ESTABLISHMENTS ON INDIAN TRIBAL LANDS IN CALIFORNIA?

BASED TO LIKELY VOTERS IN THE FEBRUARY PRIMARY ELECTION

TOTAL REG VOTER	EDUCATION					HOUSEHOLD INCOME				RELIGION				BRN AGAIN		TENURE		UNION						
	H.S.	SOME	POST	COLLG	GRAD	UNDR	\$20K	\$40K	\$80K	PROTS/	CATH-	OTHER	NO	CHRSTN	OLIC	RELIG	PREF	YES	NO	OWNER	RENTR	YES	NO	
	REG	GRAD/	CLLG/	COLLG	GRAD	UNDR	\$20K	\$39K	\$79K	PLUS	CHRSTN	OLIC	RELIG	PREF	YES	NO	OWNER	RENTR	YES	NO	YES	NO		
	LESS	TRADE	GRAD	GRAD	WORK	\$20K	\$39K	\$79K	PLUS	CHRSTN	OLIC	RELIG	PREF	YES	NO	OWNER	RENTR	YES	NO	YES	NO			
866	191	300	223	145	69	137	211	319	320	202	141	168	184	674	665	176	228	626						
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
357	92	126	80	55	36	63	87	124	129	93	57	66	72	281	253	94	110	244						
41.2%	48.3%	42.0%	36.0%	38.2%	52.2%	46.2%	41.4%	38.9%	40.3%	46.2%	40.8%	38.9%	38.8%	41.8%	38.0%	53.2%	48.2%	39.0%						
389	66	139	108	73	26	56	91	155	152	72	69	78	93	294	313	67	95	287						
44.9%	34.6%	46.3%	48.6%	50.4%	37.3%	41.1%	43.2%	48.5%	47.4%	35.8%	49.4%	46.2%	50.6%	43.6%	47.1%	38.1%	41.7%	45.9%						
64	16	22	15	11	3	11	16	25	24	18	7	14	12	50	58	6	15	48						
7.4%	8.6%	7.2%	6.9%	7.4%	4.6%	8.3%	7.5%	8.0%	7.5%	8.7%	5.0%	8.1%	6.3%	7.4%	8.7%	3.5%	6.8%	7.6%						
57	16	14	19	6	4	6	17	15	15	19	7	11	8	49	41	9	8	47						
6.5%	8.6%	4.5%	8.5%	4.1%	5.9%	4.5%	7.9%	4.6%	4.8%	9.3%	4.8%	6.8%	4.3%	7.2%	6.2%	5.2%	3.4%	7.5%						

BASE: LIKELY VOTERS IN
FEB. PRIM. ELECTION

WEIGHTED BASE

FAVOR

OPPOSE

DEPENDS

NO OPINION

Table 62-1

Q.31: HAVE YOU SEEN, READ OR HEARD ANYTHING ABOUT FOUR SEPARATE REFERENDUMS TO RATIFY AMENDMENTS TO FOUR INDIAN GAMING COMPACTS THAT WILL APPEAR ON CALIFORNIA'S FEBRUARY PRIMARY ELECTION BALLOT AS PROPOSITIONS 94-97? BASED TO LIKELY VOTERS IN THE FEBRUARY PRIMARY ELECTION

	===== REGION=====												PARTY			LIKELIHOOD		VOTING METHOD		
	COUNTIES												REGISTRATION			OF VOTING		=====		
	TOTAL	COS-		IN-		AREA						NON-	FEB.	NOV.	PRE-	ABS-	ABS-			
REG	SO.	NO.	TAL	LAND	LOS	SAN	OTHER	CNTRL	S.F.	OTHER	DEMO-	REPUB	PART/	PRI-	GENRL	CINT	TEE	TEE	TEE	
VOTER	CA.	CA.	CNTY	CNTY	ANGLS	DIEGO	ORANG	SOUTH	VALLY	BAY	NORTH	CRAT	LICAN	OTHER	MARY	ELECN	VOTER	VOTER	VOTER	
BASE: LIKELY VOTERS IN FEB. PRIM. ELECTION																				
WEIGHTED BASE	866	507	359	635	231	216	76	80	116	146	190	43	399	322	145	866	839	460	397	276
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
YES	235	132	103	168	67	52	25	20	31	42	55	9	110	89	36	235	229	126	106	78
	27.1%	26.0%	28.7%	26.5%	28.9%	24.1%	33.2%	24.8%	26.9%	29.0%	29.2%	21.4%	27.6%	27.6%	24.9%	27.1%	27.3%	27.3%	26.8%	28.1%
NO	605	359	246	444	162	154	51	57	82	103	128	31	278	220	107	605	586	321	279	190
	69.9%	70.8%	68.6%	69.9%	69.9%	71.2%	66.8%	71.6%	70.6%	70.1%	67.7%	72.7%	69.7%	68.3%	74.0%	69.9%	69.8%	69.8%	70.2%	68.7%
NO OPINION	26	16	10	23	3	10	-	3	3	1	6	3	11	13	2	26	24	14	12	9
	3.0%	3.1%	2.7%	3.6%	1.2%	4.7%		3.6%	2.4%	0.9%	3.1%	5.9%	2.7%	4.1%	1.1%	3.0%	2.9%	2.9%	3.0%	3.2%

Table 62-2

Q.31: HAVE YOU SEEN, READ OR HEARD ANYTHING ABOUT FOUR SEPARATE REFERENDUMS TO RATIFY AMENDMENTS TO FOUR INDIAN GAMING COMPACTS THAT WILL APPEAR ON CALIFORNIA'S FEBRUARY PRIMARY ELECTION BALLOT AS PROPOSITIONS 94-97? BASED TO LIKELY VOTERS IN THE FEBRUARY PRIMARY ELECTION

TOTAL REG VOTER	GENDER		AGE					ETHNICITY					POLITICAL IDEOLOGY					MARITAL STATUS		
	MALE	FEM	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65 PLUS	WHITE NON- HISPN	LA- TINO	BLACK	ASIAN /OTHR	CONSERVATV STRNG CNSRV	MDDLE MODER CNSRV	LIBERAL THE ROAD	LIBERAL MODER LIBRL	LIBERAL STRNG LIBRL	MRRD/ LIVE TOGTH	SEPRT DVRG/ WIDOW	NEVER MARRD	
WEIGHTED BASE	866	384	483	84	131	187	269	195	609	176	36	52	179	89	379	93	126	582	131	144
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
YES	235	123	112	17	26	47	91	54	176	35	13	14	50	20	96	30	39	170	38	25
	27.1%	32.0%	23.3%	20.4%	19.4%	25.3%	33.8%	27.9%	28.9%	19.8%	35.8%	26.4%	27.7%	22.9%	25.3%	32.0%	31.3%	29.2%	29.0%	17.5%
NO	605	251	355	65	101	138	169	132	416	133	23	38	122	65	273	60	85	397	89	113
	69.9%	65.3%	73.5%	77.5%	76.9%	74.0%	63.0%	67.5%	68.3%	75.7%	62.5%	72.5%	68.1%	73.8%	72.0%	64.6%	67.4%	68.3%	68.1%	78.5%
NO OPINION	26	10	16	2	5	1	9	9	17	8	1	1	8	3	10	3	2	14	4	6
	3.0%	2.6%	3.2%	2.1%	3.7%	0.7%	3.2%	4.6%	2.7%	4.4%	1.7%	1.1%	4.2%	3.3%	2.7%	3.5%	1.2%	2.5%	2.9%	4.0%

Table 62-3

Q.31: HAVE YOU SEEN, READ OR HEARD ANYTHING ABOUT FOUR SEPARATE REFERENDUMS TO RATIFY AMENDMENTS TO FOUR INDIAN GAMING COMPACTS THAT WILL APPEAR ON CALIFORNIA'S FEBRUARY PRIMARY ELECTION BALLOT AS PROPOSITIONS 94-97?
 BASED TO LIKELY VOTERS IN THE FEBRUARY PRIMARY ELECTION

	EDUCATION				HOUSEHOLD INCOME				RELIGION				BRN AGAIN		TENURE		UNION		
	TOTAL	H.S. REG	SOME GRAD/ LESS	COLLG/ TRADE GRAD	POST GRAD WORK	UNDR \$20K	\$20K \$39K	\$40K \$79K	\$80K PLUS	PROTS/ CHRSTN	CATH- OLIC	OTHER RELIG	NO PREF	CHRISTIAN	NO	OWNER	RENTR	AFFILIATED	NO
WEIGHTED BASE	866	191	300	223	145	69	137	211	319	320	202	141	168	184	674	665	176	228	626
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
YES	235	41	88	63	41	20	28	53	109	87	57	42	37	45	188	192	40	63	170
	27.1%	21.7%	29.4%	28.1%	28.0%	29.6%	20.5%	25.0%	34.1%	27.2%	28.1%	30.1%	22.2%	24.5%	27.9%	28.9%	22.9%	27.5%	27.2%
NO	605	144	200	155	104	45	108	151	206	224	139	91	129	134	465	457	127	156	441
	69.9%	75.2%	66.6%	69.5%	71.4%	64.5%	79.1%	71.7%	64.7%	70.0%	68.9%	64.6%	76.8%	72.6%	69.1%	68.7%	72.4%	68.5%	70.4%
NO OPINION	26	6	12	5	1	4	1	7	4	9	6	7	2	5	20	16	8	9	15
	3.0%	3.1%	3.9%	2.4%	0.6%	5.9%	0.4%	3.4%	1.2%	2.8%	2.9%	5.3%	1.0%	2.9%	3.0%	2.3%	4.8%	3.9%	2.4%

Table 63-1

Q.32: (AS YOU KNOW) THESE REFERENDUM ARE AMENDMENTS TO FOUR INDIAN GAMING COMPACTS. A "YES" VOTE ON EACH APPROVES AND A "NO" VOTE REJECTS A LAW THAT RATIFIES AN AMENDMENT TO EXISTING GAMING COMPACTS BETWEEN THE STATE AND FOUR SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INDIAN TRIBES. FISCAL IMPACT: NET INCREASE IN ANNUAL STATE REVENUES FROM EACH REFERENDUM PROBABLY IN THE TENS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS, GROWING OVER TIME THROUGH THE YEAR 2030. IF THE ELECTION WERE BEING HELD TODAY, WOULD YOU VOTE YES OR NO ON PROPOSITIONS 94 THROUGH 97? BASED TO LIKELY VOTERS IN THE FEBRUARY PRIMARY ELECTION

TOTAL REG VOTER	===== REGION=====												PARTY			LIKELIHOOD		VOTING METHOD		
	COUNTIES												REGISTRATION			OF VOTING		=====		
	REG	SO.	NO.	TAL	IN-	AREA							DEM-	REPUB	NON-	FEB.	NOV.	PRE-	ABS-	ABS-
CA.	CA.	CA.	CNTY	CNTY	LOS	SAN	ORANG	SOUTH	CNTRL	S.F.	OTHER	CRAT	LICAN	OTHER	MARY	ELECN	VOTER	VOTER	VOTER	
866	507	359	635	231	216	76	80	116	146	190	43	399	322	145	866	839	460	397	276	
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
340	214	126	246	95	93	31	28	52	55	69	12	157	137	46	340	328	196	142	93	
39.3%	42.3%	35.1%	38.7%	41.0%	43.0%	40.6%	35.1%	45.1%	37.7%	36.4%	28.8%	39.4%	42.6%	31.5%	39.3%	39.1%	42.6%	35.8%	33.8%	
288	163	125	207	81	64	23	30	40	56	65	9	122	105	60	288	284	146	139	105	
33.2%	32.1%	34.7%	32.5%	35.0%	29.8%	30.6%	37.2%	34.5%	38.4%	34.4%	21.1%	30.6%	32.5%	41.7%	33.2%	33.9%	31.6%	34.9%	37.8%	
238	130	108	183	55	59	22	22	24	35	55	21	119	80	39	238	227	119	116	78	
27.5%	25.6%	30.1%	28.8%	24.0%	27.2%	28.8%	27.7%	20.5%	23.9%	29.2%	50.2%	29.9%	24.8%	26.8%	27.5%	27.1%	25.8%	29.3%	28.4%	

BASE: LIKELY VOTERS IN
FEB. PRIM. ELECTION

WEIGHTED BASE

YES

NO

NO OPINION

Table 63-2

Q.32: (AS YOU KNOW) THESE REFERENDUM ARE AMENDMENTS TO FOUR INDIAN GAMING COMPACTS. A "YES" VOTE ON EACH APPROVES AND A "NO" VOTE REJECTS A LAW THAT RATIFIES AN AMENDMENT TO EXISTING GAMING COMPACTS BETWEEN THE STATE AND FOUR SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INDIAN TRIBES. FISCAL IMPACT: NET INCREASE IN ANNUAL STATE REVENUES FROM EACH REFERENDUM PROBABLY IN THE TENS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS, GROWING OVER TIME THROUGH THE YEAR 2030. IF THE ELECTION WERE BEING HELD TODAY, WOULD YOU VOTE YES OR NO ON PROPOSITIONS 94 THROUGH 97? BASED TO LIKELY VOTERS IN THE FEBRUARY PRIMARY ELECTION

TOTAL REG VOTER	GENDER		AGE					ETHNICITY					POLITICAL IDEOLOGY					MARITAL STATUS		
	MALE	FEM	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65 PLUS	WHITE HISPN	NON- TINO	LA- BLACK	ASIAN /OTHR	CONSERVATV CNSRV	MDDLE MODER	LIBERAL ROAD	LIBERAL LIBRL	MRRD/ LIVE	SEPRT DVRC/ NEVER			
866	384	483	84	131	187	269	195	609	176	36	52	179	89	379	93	126	582	131	144	
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
YES	340	176	164	38	48	67	117	72	227	83	12	20	72	39	154	33	44	216	52	71
	39.3%	46.0%	34.0%	44.7%	36.2%	35.8%	43.4%	36.7%	37.2%	47.0%	33.4%	38.4%	40.1%	43.5%	40.6%	35.0%	34.6%	37.1%	39.5%	49.2%
NO	288	124	164	28	51	68	78	63	198	54	18	22	72	29	112	34	41	200	40	43
	33.2%	32.3%	33.9%	33.3%	38.8%	36.5%	28.9%	32.1%	32.5%	30.6%	50.3%	43.2%	40.3%	32.8%	29.6%	36.1%	32.2%	34.4%	30.5%	29.9%
NO OPINION	238	83	155	19	33	52	74	61	184	39	6	10	35	21	113	27	42	166	39	30
	27.5%	21.7%	32.1%	22.0%	25.0%	27.7%	27.6%	31.2%	30.3%	22.3%	16.3%	18.4%	19.6%	23.7%	29.8%	28.9%	33.2%	28.5%	30.0%	20.9%

Table 63-3

Q.32: (AS YOU KNOW) THESE REFERENDUM ARE AMENDMENTS TO FOUR INDIAN GAMING COMPACTS. A "YES" VOTE ON EACH APPROVES AND A "NO" VOTE REJECTS A LAW THAT RATIFIES AN AMENDMENT TO EXISTING GAMING COMPACTS BETWEEN THE STATE AND FOUR SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INDIAN TRIBES. FISCAL IMPACT: NET INCREASE IN ANNUAL STATE REVENUES FROM EACH REFERENDUM PROBABLY IN THE TENS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS, GROWING OVER TIME THROUGH THE YEAR 2030. IF THE ELECTION WERE BEING HELD TODAY, WOULD YOU VOTE YES OR NO ON PROPOSITIONS 94 THROUGH 97? BASED TO LIKELY VOTERS IN THE FEBRUARY PRIMARY ELECTION

	EDUCATION					HOUSEHOLD INCOME				RELIGION				BRN AGAIN		TENURE		UNION		
	TOTAL	H.S.	SOME	POST		UNDR	\$20K	\$40K	\$80K	PROTS/	CATH-	OTHER	NO	CHRISTIAN	HOME	OWNER	RENTR	AFFILIATED		
	REG	GRAD/	CLLG/	COLLG	GRAD	\$20K	\$39K	\$79K	PLUS	CHRSTN	OLIC	RELIG	PREF	YES	NO	OWNER	RENTR	YES	NO	
	VOTER	LESS	TRADE	GRAD	WORK															
BASE: LIKELY VOTERS IN FEB. PRIM. ELECTION																				
WEIGHTED BASE	866	191	300	223	145	69	137	211	319	320	202	141	168	184	674	665	176	228	626	
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
YES	340	85	117	75	61	33	56	81	130	128	89	46	64	67	271	262	69	95	243	
	39.3%	44.6%	38.8%	33.8%	42.3%	47.1%	41.3%	38.6%	40.9%	40.1%	44.2%	32.7%	38.1%	36.2%	40.3%	39.4%	39.4%	41.7%	38.9%	
NO	288	52	103	86	43	16	44	76	108	108	65	56	46	75	210	215	61	80	200	
	33.2%	27.3%	34.2%	38.8%	29.8%	22.7%	32.0%	35.9%	34.0%	33.6%	32.3%	39.7%	27.6%	40.6%	31.1%	32.4%	34.5%	35.2%	32.0%	
NO OPINION	238	54	81	61	41	21	36	54	80	84	48	39	58	43	193	187	46	53	183	
	27.5%	28.1%	27.0%	27.3%	28.0%	30.2%	26.6%	25.5%	25.1%	26.4%	23.5%	27.5%	34.3%	23.3%	28.6%	28.2%	26.1%	23.1%	29.2%	

Table 63-4

Q.32: (AS YOU KNOW) THESE REFERENDUM ARE AMENDMENTS TO FOUR INDIAN GAMING COMPACTS. A "YES" VOTE ON EACH APPROVES AND A "NO" VOTE REJECTS A LAW THAT RATIFIES AN AMENDMENT TO EXISTING GAMING COMPACTS BETWEEN THE STATE AND FOUR SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INDIAN TRIBES. FISCAL IMPACT: NET INCREASE IN ANNUAL STATE REVENUES FROM EACH REFERENDUM PROBABLY IN THE TENS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS, GROWING OVER TIME THROUGH THE YEAR 2030. IF THE ELECTION WERE BEING HELD TODAY, WOULD YOU VOTE YES OR NO ON PROPOSITIONS 94 THROUGH 97? BASED TO LIKELY VOTERS IN THE FEBRUARY PRIMARY ELECTION

Q.30: IN GENERAL, DO YOU FAVOR OR OPPOSE EXPANDING THE NUMBER OF CASINO GAMING ESTABLISHMENTS ON INDIAN TRIBAL LANDS IN CALIFORNIA

	TOTAL FAVOR		OPPOSE	DEPENDS	NO OPINION
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
BASE: LIKELY VOTERS IN FEB. PRIM. ELECTION					
WEIGHTED BASE	866	357	389	64	57
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
YES	340	227	68	26	19
	39%	64%	18%	41%	33%
NO	288	58	200	14	16
	33%	16%	52%	21%	27%
NO OPINION	238	71	120	24	22
	27%	20%	31%	38%	39%