

**USC SCHWARZENEGGER
INSTITUTE - USC PRICE
CALIFORNIA ISSUES POLL
FALL 2022
GENERAL ELECTION POLL**

The USC Schwarzenegger Institute California Issues Poll is a representative survey of California registered voters and was fielded from 10/30/2022 to 11/02/2022.

Dr. Christian Grose

Academic Director, USC Schwarzenegger Institute
Professor, University of Southern California
Director, California Issues Poll
Email: cgrose@usc.edu

Raquel Centeno

Ph.D. Student, University of Southern California

The USC Schwarzenegger Institute-USC Price California Issues Poll

General Election Poll of California Voters

November 4, 2022

Lead Researchers:

Dr. Christian Grose, USC Professor of Public Policy and Political Science

Raquel Centeno, USC Ph.D. candidate in Political Science

The USC Schwarzenegger Institute-USC Price California Issues Poll is a representative survey of registered voters who live in the state of California. It is a snapshot of California voters' attitudes on the dates in which it was conducted. The poll is conducted by Dr. Christian Grose, Raquel Centeno, and the student participants in the USC Schwarzenegger Institute Democracy Lab. Students and colleagues at USC as part of the Democracy Lab designed and wrote questions for the poll, and developed, fielded, and implemented the poll. The survey was fielded from October 30 to November 2, 2022.

Survey methodology and details: A representative polling sample of 802 registered California voters was randomly drawn off the voter file and surveyed. The survey questionnaire was designed by faculty and students at the University of Southern California. The survey was fielded using Qualtrics software, though we relied upon the voter file from which to draw our respondents who participated in the survey. The USC Schwarzenegger Institute-USC Price California Issues Poll uses post-stratification weighting for age, gender, ethnicity/race, and party registration. Survey weights were estimated using the "anesrake" package in the statistical program R. The anesrake statistical package uses the weighting algorithm that was developed by Dr. Josh Pasek. This algorithm uses an iterative and multiplicative raking model to generate individual weights for each respondent; and these weights are then used to ensure the sample is representative of the California electorate. Because we are interested in measuring all California voters' issue and policy attitudes, the baseline universe of interest is the population of California registered voters. Respondents were given the choice of 'don't know' unless the cross-tabular results below do not show 'don't know' as an option. For vote choice questions, given the nature of the top-two general election, voters were only given the option to select 2 candidates and were not given a 'don't know' option. Similarly, for the ballot proposition questions, 'don't know' was not an option but respondents could skip the question. Because the universe of interest is weighted to the registered voter population, differences in turnout within subgroups in 2022 may lead the actual results to differ from the snapshot-in-time results presented here. In the topline results and cross-tabs, totals may not sum to 100 due to rounding. The margin of error is +/-3.5 %-points.

Media Inquiries: Please contact Dr. Christian Grose, cgrose@usc.edu and Raquel Centeno at racenten@usc.edu.

Key poll findings:

The most important issue for California voters right before the 2022 election is inflation/cost of living; followed close behind by homelessness; and the environment/climate. In an open-ended top-of-mind question, 15% of California voters said that inflation or the rising cost of living was the #1 issue in the state. Homelessness was the 2nd most important issue with 13% of voters rating it the top issue. 11% of California voters rated the environment/climate change as the most important issue facing the state. Other issues rated as the most important by Californians were crime (8%), affordable housing/housing (7%), the economy (7%), drought/water (4%), immigration (3%), taxes (3%), women's health and abortion (3%), democracy (3%), and gas prices (3%). All other issues were mentioned by less than 1% of voters.

Telling voters about threats to election workers surprisingly encourages California voters to want to participate in the democratic process. In the last several months, there have been increasing threats and intimidation directed toward nonpartisan election administrators and poll workers. We asked California voters if they would be willing to step up and serve as a poll worker in the future. When California voters were told about threats to poll workers, 35% of voters said they wanted to sign up to become a poll worker to help administer elections in the future. Independent voters were particularly interested in signing up to be a poll worker (41% said they were willing to be a poll worker after learning of threats, higher than interest from both Democrats and Republicans). While the threats to election workers are alarming, such messages of alarm rally California voters to want to participate more.

Governor Gavin Newsom is poised to win the California governor's race resoundingly. Governor Gavin Newsom is polling 62% and Republican Brian Dahle is polling at 38%. This is similar to the vote margin in the recent recall election. For the governor's race, as well as other statewide elections, the poll gave voters the names of candidates and their occupations and party affiliations exactly as displayed on California voters' ballots.¹ This method is more accurate than other methods that only ask names without other identifying information in polls.

Senator Alex Padilla is likely to win easily over his opponent in the U.S. Senate election. Padilla is the choice of 63% of California voters in the poll, while his opponent Mark Meuser received 37%.

Democrats perform well in other statewide election contests. In most other statewide races, Democratic candidates Eleni Kounalakis (Lt. Governor), Shirley Weber (Secretary of State), Fiona Ma (Treasurer), Rob Bonta (Attorney General), and Ricardo Lara (Insurance Commissioner) are polling at numbers that indicate relatively easy victories on Election Day. There is a significant partisan divide with most Democratic voters supporting these candidates and most Republicans supporting their opponents.

Republican Lanhee Chen is the most competitive Republican candidate on this year's ballot for statewide office, though Democrat Malia Cohen is beating him in the race for Controller. In the open seat for Controller, Malia Cohen is preferred by more voters than Lanhee Chen (58% Cohen to 42% Chen). However, this is the most electorally competitive statewide election as Chen is drawing more support from independent voters (56% for Chen) and Asian American voters (62% for Chen) than most other Republicans in other statewide elections. Cohen is winning large majorities of voters who are Democrat. She is also receiving more support from women voters (65% for Cohen) and Latino voters (63% for Cohen).

¹ The Superintendent of Public Instruction is nonpartisan so only occupations were displayed in the poll for those two candidates.

The generic congressional ballot question favors Democrats in California. 63% of voters in California, when asked if they will vote for the Democrat or Republican in congressional elections, choose the Democrat; and 37% choose the Republican. This is a statewide result.

A majority of California voters oppose the proposed policy to open supervised drug-use injection site pilot programs in the cities of Los Angeles, Oakland, and San Francisco. The state legislature recently passed this bill and the governor vetoed it. 54% of California voters disapprove of the supervised drug-use injection sites (42% strongly disapprove and 12% slightly disapprove). Only 17% of California registered voters strongly approve of this policy and 19% slightly approve (total approve: 36%).

A slight majority of voters approve of the recent decision to ban the sale of new gasoline powered cars by 2035. In total, 52% of voters approve and 43% disapprove with 32% strongly approving, 20% slightly approving, 8% slightly disapproving, and 35% strongly disapproving. There is a divide by income with those making more than \$100,000 a year being the least favorable toward this policy (34% strongly approve, 36% strongly disapprove).

A significant majority of voters favor the Contraceptive Equity Act of 2022 that was recently passed by the state legislature and signed by the Governor. This law requires insurers to cover male sterilization and nonprescription birth control. 51% of voters strongly approve of this policy, and 20% strongly disapprove. There was a significant difference by gender: 61% of women strongly approve and 14% of women slightly approve of this policy; and 42% of men strongly approve and 18% of men slightly approve.

California voters approve of other policies regarding environmental regulation in the San Joaquin Valley and kindergarten education. These two policies were recently passed by the legislature but ultimately vetoed by the governor. A majority of California voters approve of the policy that would require the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to assert control over the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (57% approve in total: 28% strongly approve; 29% slightly approve). California registered voters also support SB70, which would require children to attend kindergarten before attending first grade (60% approve either strongly or slightly). Among racial and ethnic groups, Latino voters were most likely to support the kindergarten policy with 43% of Latino voters strongly approving of this policy and 23% slightly approving.

California voters are largely divided on the regulation of free speech on social media. While 22% of voters said that social media platforms have been balanced in their approach to free speech, the rest are evenly divided on whether social media companies are too strict (39%) or not strict enough (39%) in regulating speech on their platforms. There are gendered differences in attitudes as 47% of men said companies are too strict in their regulations while 44% of women said they are not strict enough. California voters were also divided in their approval of Elon Musk purchasing Twitter (32% strongly approve; 33% strongly disapprove).

On federal election law matters, California voters do not want to see the U.S. Supreme Court overturn Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. California voters do not want to see the U.S. Supreme Court strike down a part of the Voting Rights Act in *Merrill v. Milligan* (64% prefer that the U.S. Supreme Court uphold Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act). California voters also would like to see state-level voting rights protections for voters of color that are similar to current federal regulations. A majority (54%) of California voters would support a state-level attempt to create new voting rights rules for redistricting if the U.S. Supreme Court overturns Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. 22% would not support such a state policy, and the rest are not sure (23%).

California voters do not want the U.S. Supreme Court to support the “independent state legislature theory” of elections and overturn the state’s election procedures. California voters oppose the independent state legislature theory that might change how the state conducts its congressional redistricting and runs its elections. This is being taken up by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Moore v. Harper*. 73% of California voters want the U.S. Supreme Court to keep the current election rules in place so California voters and citizen commissions can make decisions about elections, while few California voters hope the Court overturns the rules under the independent state legislature theory.

Ballot propositions headed toward passage? Proposition 1/reproductive freedom and Proposition 28/arts and music education. Proposition 1, the Constitutional Right to Reproductive Freedom, enjoys wide support among California voters. After reading the text of the ballot, 68% of voters say they will vote yes and 32% say they will vote no. Both Democratic and Republican voters appear to favor Prop 1 with Democratic voters more supportive. Proposition 28, a ballot proposition to give additional funding to arts and music education in public schools also enjoys wide support with 69% supporting and 31% opposing in the poll.

Ballot propositions headed toward defeat? Both ballot propositions that deal with gaming are opposed by a majority of California voters. When voters are required to choose whether they will vote yes or no, majorities of voters oppose Prop 26 to allow in-person roulette, dice games, and sports wagering on tribal lands. A large majority of California voters also oppose Prop 27 to allow online and mobile sports wagering outside tribal lands. Women are more likely to oppose both Prop 26 and Prop 27 than are men.

Voters are split on Prop 30 (funding for air pollution/higher taxes), and statistically this is an unpredictable tie going into Election Day. The other ballot proposition included in the California Issues Poll was Prop 30, which seeks to provide funding for programs to reduce air pollution and prevent wildfires by increasing tax on personal income over \$2 million. 53% of voters in the poll support this ballot proposition, and 47% oppose the ballot proposition. This is well within the margin of error given that some voters skipped this question on the poll (as some may also choose to do on Election Day).

Topline results – most important issue:

What is the most important issue facing California right now? Please answer by writing one word or phrase below. [open ended responses where respondents could choose any issue from the top of mind]

15% Inflation/cost of living

13% Homelessness/unhoused population

11% Environment/climate change

8% Crime

7% Affordable housing/housing

7% Economy

6% Other

4% Drought/water

3% Immigration

3% Taxes

3% Women's health/abortion

3% Democracy

3% Gas prices

≤1% All other issue mentions

Topline results – threats to democracy and poll workers:

Any registered voter can sign up to be a poll worker to help administer elections at polling locations in California.

Poll workers are currently facing personal threats and intimidation from other individuals just for doing their jobs. Would you consider signing up to be a poll worker in your county in California?

35% Yes

63% No

2% I already am a poll worker

Topline results – upcoming elections

If the elections for U.S. House were being held today, would you vote for the Republican Party's candidate or the Democratic Party's candidate for Congress in your district?

63% Democrat
37% Republican

[note: for next several questions, candidates' occupations and party affiliations as shown on the California ballot were displayed to survey respondents as they are on voters' ballots; choice order was randomized]

Who do you intend to vote for? / Who did you vote for California Governor?

38% Brian Dahle (Senator/Farmer; Party Preference: Republican)
62% Gavin Newsom (Governor of California; Party Preference: Democratic)

Who do you intend to vote for? / Who did you vote for California Lieutenant Governor?

63% Eleni Kounalakis (Lieutenant Governor; Party Preference: Democratic)
37% Angela E. Underwood Jacobs (Businesswoman/Deputy Mayor; Party Preference: Republican)

Who do you intend to vote for? / Who did you vote for Secretary of State?

37% Robert Bernosky (Chief Financial Officer; Party Preference: Republican)
63% Shirley N. Weber (Appointed California Secretary of State; Party Preference: Democratic)

Who do you intend to vote for? / Who did you vote for Controller?

Party Preference: Democratic)
42% Lanhee J. Chen (Fiscal Advisor/Educator; Party Preference: Republican)
58% Malia M. Cohen (California State Board of Equalization Member; Party Preference: Democratic)

Who do you intend to vote for? / Who did you vote for Treasurer?

63% Fiona Ma (State Treasurer/CPA; Party Preference: Democratic)
37% Jack M. Guerrero (Councilmember/CPA/Economist; Party Preference: Republican)

Who do you intend to vote for? / Who did you vote for Attorney General?

40% Nathan Hochman (General Counsel; Party Preference: Republican)
60% Rob Bonta (Appointed Attorney General of the State of California; Party Preference: Democratic)

Who do you intend to vote for? / Who did you vote for Insurance Commissioner?

62% Ricardo Lara (Insurance Commissioner; Party Preference: Democratic)
38% Robert Howell (Cybersecurity Equipment Manufacturer; Party Preference: Republican)

Who do you intend to vote for? / Who did you vote for California's U.S. Senator?

63% Alex Padilla (Appointed United States Senator; Party Preference: Democratic)
37% Mark P. Meuser (Constitutional Attorney; Party Preference: Republican)

Who do you intend to vote for? / Who did you vote for Superintendent of Public Instruction?

64% Tony Thurmond (Superintendent of Public Instruction)
36% Lance Ray Christensen (Education Policy Executive)

Topline results – California policies and issues

Now we would like to ask you about several issues and public policy decisions facing the country or California. Do your best to answer the questions.

There is a bill in the California legislature focused on expanding reproductive healthcare coverage. If passed, the Contraceptive Equity Act of 2022 would require insurers to cover male sterilization and nonprescription birth control, including condoms and contraceptive sponges.

Do you approve or disapprove of this bill to mandate insurance companies to cover male sterilization and non prescription birth control?

51% Strongly approve
16% Slightly approve
6% Slightly disapprove
20% Strongly disapprove
7% Don't know

There is a bill in the California legislature focused on housing development and changing existing zoning policies that applies to the entire state. If passed, SB 6 would allow multifamily housing development projects in areas where multifamily housing was not previously allowed -- in commercially zoned areas reserved for offices and factories. The bill also encourages union bids and union wages on new construction for multifamily housing. The bill makes it easier to quickly build multifamily housing projects by relaxing environmental standards that previously slowed new construction of homes.

Do you approve or disapprove of this bill?

30% Strongly approve
22% Slightly approve
13% Slightly disapprove
21% Strongly disapprove
15% Don't know

There is a bill in the California legislature that would have allowed the creation of drug-use site pilot programs in the cities of Oakland, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. These sites would allow people to use illegal drugs under supervision in an attempt to prevent overdoses and other safety hazards. Advocates said that this measure would have improved treatment access for drug users and reduced overdoses. Opponents said that the measure would have unintended consequences for public health and safety and could exacerbate illegal activity in nearby areas. Do you approve or disapprove of this bill?

Do you approve or disapprove of this bill?

17% Strongly approve
19% Slightly approve
12% Slightly disapprove
42% Strongly disapprove
9% Don't know

California is planning to ban the sale of new gasoline powered cars by 2035. These new regulations would require that 35% of all new passenger cars sold by 2026 to have no emissions. By 2030, 68% of all new passenger cars would be required to have zero emissions.

Do you approve or disapprove of these new car regulations?

32% Strongly approve
20% Slightly approve
8% Slightly disapprove
35% Strongly disapprove
4% Don't know

There is a bill in the California legislature that would require the California Air Resources Board to intervene and assert control over the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District if the District does not attain the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) established by the United States Environmental Protection Agency. The San Joaquin Valley region has some of the state's worst air pollution, and proponents of this bill hope it will reduce air pollution. Opponents of this bill say it is unnecessary given existing laws.

Do you approve or disapprove of this bill?

28% Strongly approve
29% Slightly approve
11% Slightly disapprove
18% Strongly disapprove
15% Don't know

There is a bill in the California legislature, SB70, that would require children to attend kindergarten before entering first grade at a public school. California currently does not require kindergarten. A number of school districts and education groups support this bill, and a number of home school organizations oppose it.

Do you approve or disapprove of this bill?

35% Strongly approve
24% Slightly approve
15% Slightly disapprove
16% Strongly disapprove
10% Don't know

Topline results – social media and regulation

There has been a lot of talk recently about free speech on social media. Do you think that social media platforms have been too strict on regulating speech, not strict enough, or just right?

39% Too strict
39% Not strict enough
22% Just right

Elon Musk recently bought Twitter and promises to change who can use the platform and what people can say on the Twitter. Do you approve or disapprove of Elon Musk buying Twitter?

32% Strongly approve
9% Slightly approve
13% Slightly disapprove
33% Strongly disapprove
12% I don't have an opinion
1% I didn't know about this

Californians' attitudes toward voting rights and election law issues before the U.S. Supreme Court

In October 2022, the U.S. Supreme Court considered a case called *Merrill v. Milligan*. This case concerned the rights of Black voters in Alabama though it has implications for the whole country.

This U.S. Supreme Court decision may overturn Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, a federal law that protects minority voting rights in every U.S. state, including California. The Voting Rights Act requires that districts be drawn to protect the voting rights of Asian American, Black, Latino, and Native American voters if there is evidence of racially polarized voting and other guidance is met.

Should the U.S. Supreme Court end Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, or should the U.S. Supreme Court keep the current Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act in place?

16% The US Supreme Court should end Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act
64% The US Supreme Court should keep Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act
20% I'm not sure

If the U.S. Supreme Court ends the Voting Rights Act in *Merrill v. Milligan*, they will announce this decision some time before June 2023.

If the U.S. Supreme Court eliminates Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act for the entire country, should the California legislature pass a bill that enshrines these federal protections of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act for California voters? If California were to pass a state level bill, this might create a three-pronged process for protecting the voting rights of Asian American voters, Black voters, Latino voters, and Native American voters in California during redistricting in those areas of California that have racially polarized voting and where other criteria are met.

Would you support a Voting Rights Act in California that would restore the protections of Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act at the state level?

22% No
54% Yes
23% I'm not sure

In December 2022, the U.S. Supreme Court will consider a case called *Moore v. Harper* about something called the "independent state legislature theory." This theory argues that only state legislators can make rules on elections. If this theory is successful before the U.S. Supreme Court, it could mean voters and citizen commissions would no longer be allowed to make election rules. Right now, in California, voters and citizens' commissions are responsible for making some, but not all, decisions on how elections are run and administered. For example, California voters can currently change election rules by voting on them via ballot propositions; and the California Citizens Redistricting Commission currently redraws lines for legislators instead of allowing the legislators to redraw the lines for congressional districts.

Should the U.S. Supreme Court give power only to the state legislature to make rules about elections, or should the U.S. Supreme Court keep the current rules where voters, Commissions, legislators and others have the right to make rules about elections?

8% The US Supreme Court should overturn the current rules so that only state legislators can make decisions about elections

73% The US Supreme Court should keep the current rules in place so voters and citizen commissions can make decisions about elections

20% I'm not sure

Topline results - state ballot propositions

In the November election, California voters are asked to weigh in on a number of ballot initiatives or referenda. A ballot initiative or referendum (also called a ballot measure or proposition) is a proposed law that California voters can directly decide whether to enact. In the next section, we will be asking you for your opinion on each of these measures. Do your best to think about how you might vote on Election Day. If you do not plan to vote for a ballot proposition, just do not answer that question and move on to the next question.

Proposition 1. Constitutional Right to Reproductive Freedom. Legislative Constitutional Amendment Amends California Constitution to expressly include an individual's fundamental right to reproductive freedom, which includes the fundamental right to choose to have an abortion and the fundamental right to choose or refuse contraceptives. This amendment does not narrow or limit the existing rights to privacy and equal protection under the California Constitution. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect because reproductive rights already are protected by state law. Would you vote for this proposition?

68% Yes
32% No

Proposition 26. Allows In-Person Roulette, Dice Games, Sports Wagering on Tribal Lands. Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute. Also allows: sports wagering at certain horseracing tracks; private lawsuits to enforce gambling laws. Directs revenues to General Fund, problem-gambling programs, enforcement. Fiscal Impact: Increased state revenues, possibly reaching tens of millions of dollars annually. Some of these revenues would support increased state regulatory and enforcement costs that could reach the low tens of millions of dollars annually. Would you vote for this proposition?

38% Yes
62% No

Proposition 27. Allows Online and Mobile Sports Wagering Outside Tribal Lands. Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute. Allows Indian tribes and affiliated businesses to operate online/mobile sports wagering outside tribal lands. Directs revenues to regulatory costs, homelessness programs, nonparticipating tribes. Fiscal Impact: Increased state revenues, possibly in the hundreds of millions of dollars but not likely to exceed \$500 million annually. Some revenues would support state regulatory costs, possibly reaching the mid-tens of millions of dollars annually. Would you vote for this proposition?

30% Yes
70% No

Proposition 28. Provides Additional Funding for Arts and Music Education in Public Schools. Initiative Statute. Provides additional funding from state General Fund for arts and music education in all K-12 public schools (including charter schools). Fiscal Impact: Increased state costs of about \$1 billion annually, beginning next year, for arts education in public schools. Would you vote for this proposition?

69% Yes
31% No

Proposition 30. Provides Funding for Programs to Reduce Air Pollution and Prevent Wildfires By Increasing Tax on Personal Income Over \$2 Million. Initiative Statute. Allocates tax revenues to zero-emission vehicle purchase incentives, vehicle charging stations, and wildfire prevention. Fiscal Impact: Increased state tax revenue ranging from \$3.5 billion to \$5 billion annually, with the new funding used to support zero-emission vehicle programs and wildfire response and prevention activities. Would you vote for this proposition?

53% Yes

47% No

CROSS TABS

NEXT PAGE

Cross-tabs – threats to democracy and poll workers:

Any registered voter can sign up to be a poll worker to help administer elections at polling locations in California.

Poll workers are currently facing personal threats and intimidation from other individuals just for doing their jobs. Would you consider signing up to be a poll worker in your county in California?

All voters:

35% Yes

63% No

2% I already am a poll worker

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
% Yes	51%	26%	34%	37%	32%
% No	49%	74%	60%	63%	68%
% Already poll worker	0%	0%	6%	0%	2%

Gender*	Men	Women
% Yes	36%	33%
% No	62%	67%
% Already poll worker	3%	1%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
% Yes	33%	36%
% No	67%	62%
% Already poll worker	0%	3%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
% Yes	49%	21%	38%	27%	45%	35%
% No	47%	79%	62%	70%	55%	63%
% Already poll worker	5%	0%	0%	3%	0%	2%

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
% Yes	36%	41%	25%
% No	64%	57%	70%
% Already poll worker	0%	2%	5%

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
% Yes	49%	25%	41%
% No	51%	68%	59%
% Already poll worker	0%	7%	0%

Cross-tabs, upcoming elections

Note: When interpreting the cross-tabular results, please be mindful that the sample sizes for some subgroups are somewhat small (e.g., Black voters, some age cohorts) and therefore the margin of error for the subgroup analysis in the cross-tabs is larger than the overall margin of error for the entire poll.

If the elections for U.S. House were being held today, would you vote for the Republican Party's candidate or the Democratic Party's candidate for Congress in your district?

63% Democrat
 37% Republican

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
Democrat	65%	69%	68%	60%	39%
Republican	35%	31%	32%	40%	61%

Gender*	Men	Women
Democrat	56%	73%
Republican	44%	27%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
Democrat	57%	67%
Republican	43%	33%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
Democrat	79%	67%	55%	47%	55%	58%
Republican	21%	33%	45%	53%	45%	42%

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
Democrat	98%	51%	8%
Republican	2%	49%	92%

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
Democrat	75%	69%	58%
Republican	25%	31%	41%

Who do you intend to vote for? / Who did you vote for California Governor?

38% Brian Dahle (Senator/Farmer; Party Preference: Republican)
 62% Gavin Newsom (Governor of California; Party Preference: Democratic)

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
Brian Dahle	36%	31%	32%	43%	54%
Gavin Newsom	64%	69%	68%	57%	46%

Gender*	Men	Women
Brian Dahle	46%	28%
Gavin Newsom	54%	72%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
Brian Dahle	45%	34%
Gavin Newsom	56%	66%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
Brian Dahle	23%	33%	46%	55%	45%	45%
Gavin Newsom	77%	67%	54%	45%	55%	55%

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
Brian Dahle	3%	51%	92%
Gavin Newsom	97%	49%	8%

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
Brian Dahle	25%	33%	43%
Gavin Newsom	75%	67%	57%

Who do you intend to vote for? / Who did you vote for California Lieutenant Governor?

63% Eleni Kounalakis (Lieutenant Governor; Party Preference: Democratic)
 37% Angela E. Underwood Jacobs (Businesswoman/Deputy Mayor; Party Preference: Republican)

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
Eleni Kounalakis	70%	72%	68%	58%	47%
Angela E. Underwood Jacobs	30%	28%	32%	42%	53%

Gender*	Men	Women
Eleni Kounalakis	55%	73%
Angela E. Underwood Jacobs	45%	27%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
Eleni Kounalakis	55%	67%
Angela E. Underwood Jacobs	45%	33%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
Eleni Kounalakis	79%	66%	58%	45%	52%	57%
Angela E. Underwood Jacobs	21%	34%	42%	55%	48%	43%

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
Eleni Kounalakis	97%	52%	8%
Angela E. Underwood Jacobs	3%	48%	92%

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
Eleni Kounalakis	77%	67%	57%
Angela E. Underwood Jacobs	23%	33%	43%

Who do you intend to vote for? / Who did you vote for Secretary of State?

37% Robert Bernosky (Chief Financial Officer; Party Preference: Republican)

63% Shirley N. Weber (Appointed California Secretary of State; Party Preference: Democratic)

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
Robert Bernosky	36%	30%	35%	41%	61%
Shirley N. Weber	64%	70%	65%	59%	39%

Gender*	Men	Women
Robert Bernosky	44%	29%
Shirley N. Weber	56%	71%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
Robert Bernosky	44%	34%
Shirley N. Weber	56%	66%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
Robert Bernosky	21%	37%	43%	55%	46%	42%
Shirley N. Weber	79%	63%	57%	45%	54%	58%

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
Robert Bernosky	4%	51%	91%
Shirley N. Weber	96%	49%	9%

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
Robert Bernosky	22%	32%	44%
Shirley N. Weber	78%	68%	56%

Who do you intend to vote for? / Who did you vote for Controller?

42% Lanhee J. Chen (Fiscal Advisor/Educator; Party Preference: Republican)

58% Malia M. Cohen (California State Board of Equalization Member; Party Preference: Democratic)

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
Lanhee J. Chen	62%	36%	37%	43%	49%
Malia M. Cohen	38%	64%	63%	57%	51%

Gender*	Men	Women
Lanhee J. Chen	46%	35%
Malia M. Cohen	54%	65%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
Lanhee J. Chen	45%	39%
Malia M. Cohen	55%	61%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
Lanhee J. Chen	28%	37%	45%	56%	47%	54%
Malia M. Cohen	72%	63%	55%	44%	53%	46%

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
Lanhee J. Chen	8%	56%	92%
Malia M. Cohen	92%	44%	8%

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
Lanhee J. Chen	33%	38%	46%
Malia M. Cohen	67%	62%	54%

Who do you intend to vote for? / Who did you vote for Treasurer?

63% Fiona Ma (State Treasurer/CPA; Party Preference: Democratic)
 37% Jack M. Guerrero (Councilmember/CPA/Economist; Party Preference: Republican)

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
Fiona Ma	51%	71%	66%	60%	54%
Jack M. Guerrero	49%	29%	34%	40%	46%

Gender*	Men	Women
Fiona Ma	56%	71%
Jack M. Guerrero	44%	29%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
Fiona Ma	55%	67%
Jack M. Guerrero	45%	33%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
Fiona Ma	76%	68%	56%	44%	55%	59%
Jack M. Guerrero	24%	32%	44%	56%	45%	41%

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
Fiona Ma	97%	46%	13%
Jack M. Guerrero	3%	54%	87%

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
Fiona Ma	76%	66%	57%
Jack M. Guerrero	24%	34%	43%

Who do you intend to vote for? / Who did you vote for Attorney General?

39% Nathan Hochman (General Counsel; Party Preference: Republican)

61% Rob Bonta (Appointed Attorney General of the State of California; Party Preference: Democratic)

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
Nathan Hochman	44%	39%	36%	41%	61%
Rob Bonta	56%	61%	64%	59%	39%

Gender*	Men	Women
Nathan Hochman	47%	30%
Rob Bonta	53%	70%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
Nathan Hochman	45%	37%
Rob Bonta	55%	63%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
Nathan Hochman	26%	38%	46%	53%	45%	45%
Rob Bonta	74%	62%	54%	47%	55%	55%

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
Nathan Hochman	6%	53%	92%
Rob Bonta	94%	47%	8%

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
Nathan Hochman	24%	37%	44%
Rob Bonta	76%	63%	56%

Who do you intend to vote for? / Who did you vote for Insurance Commissioner?

62% Ricardo Lara (Insurance Commissioner; Party Preference: Democratic)
 38% Robert Howell (Cybersecurity Equipment Manufacturer; Party Preference: Republican)

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
Ricardo Lara	41%	66%	69%	59%	58%
Robert Howell	59%	34%	31%	41%	42%

Gender*	Men	Women
Ricardo Lara	55%	70%
Robert Howell	45%	30%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
Ricardo Lara	56%	66%
Robert Howell	44%	34%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
Ricardo Lara	76%	66%	56%	47%	56%	55%
Robert Howell	24%	34%	44%	53%	44%	45%

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
Ricardo Lara	96%	52%	7%
Robert Howell	4%	48%	93%

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
Ricardo Lara	78%	65%	56%
Robert Howell	22%	35%	44%

Who do you intend to vote for? / Who did you vote for California's U.S. Senator?

63% Alex Padilla (Appointed United States Senator; Party Preference: Democratic)
 37% Mark P. Meuser (Constitutional Attorney; Party Preference: Republican)

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
Alex Padilla	65%	70%	67%	60%	40%
Mark P. Meuser	35%	30%	33%	40%	60%

Gender*	Men	Women
Alex Padilla	56%	72%
Mark P. Meuser	44%	28%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
Alex Padilla	56%	67%
Mark P. Meuser	44%	33%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
Alex Padilla	79%	67%	54%	48%	54%	57%
Mark P. Meuser	21%	33%	46%	52%	46%	43%

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
Alex Padilla	98%	52%	6%
Mark P. Meuser	2%	48%	94%

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
Alex Padilla	76%	66%	59%
Mark P. Meuser	24%	34%	41%

Who do you intend to vote for? / Who did you vote for Superintendent of Public Instruction?

64% Tony Thurmond (Superintendent of Public Instruction)

36% Lance Ray Christensen (Education Policy Executive)

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
Tony Thurmond	60%	61%	62%	66%	53%
Lance Ray Christensen	40%	39%	38%	34%	47%

Gender*	Men	Women
Tony Thurmond	61%	68%
Lance Ray Christensen	39%	32%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
Tony Thurmond	66%	63%
Lance Ray Christensen	34%	37%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
Tony Thurmond	70%	61%	59%	62%	64%	63%
Lance Ray Christensen	30%	39%	41%	38%	36%	37%

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
Tony Thurmond	82%	52%	41%
Lance Ray Christensen	18%	48%	59%

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
Tony Thurmond	67%	70%	60%
Lance Ray Christensen	33%	30%	40%

Cross-tabs - California policies and issues:

There is a bill in the California legislature focused on expanding reproductive healthcare coverage. If passed, the Contraceptive Equity Act of 2022 would require insurers to cover male sterilization and nonprescription birth control, including condoms and contraceptive sponges.

Do you approve or disapprove of this bill to mandate insurance companies to cover male sterilization and nonprescription birth control?

51% Strongly approve
 16% Slightly approve
 6% Slightly disapprove
 20% Strongly disapprove
 7% Don't know

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
Strongly approve	42%	50%	58%	47%	46%
Slightly approve	35%	18%	11%	18%	17%
Slightly disapprove	0%	9%	2%	7%	15%
Strongly disapprove	9%	21%	22%	20%	20%
Don't know	15%	3%	7%	8%	1%

Gender*	Men	Women
Strongly approve	42%	61%
Slightly approve	18%	14%
Slightly disapprove	5%	6%
Strongly disapprove	27%	12%
Don't know	7%	7%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
Strongly approve	51%	51%
Slightly approve	11%	19%
Slightly disapprove	5%	6%
Strongly disapprove	21%	20%
Don't know	12%	4%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
Strongly approve	59%	59%	49%	41%	39%	36%
Slightly approve	17%	19%	14%	13%	16%	19%
Slightly disapprove	2%	1%	5%	10%	14%	13%
Strongly disapprove	13%	20%	27%	26%	24%	23%
Don't know	9%	2%	4%	10%	7%	9%

USC Schwarzenegger Institute-USC Price California Issues Poll
 General Election Poll of California Registered Voters, N=802 registered voters
 October 30 to November 2 2022. Margin of error +/- 3.5

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
Strongly approve	73%	43%	15%
Slightly approve	17%	20%	12%
Slightly disapprove	4%	3%	12%
Strongly disapprove	2%	27%	50%
Don't know	5%	7%	10%

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
Strongly approve	67%	48%	51%
Slightly approve	8%	23%	17%
Slightly disapprove	3%	3%	6%
Strongly disapprove	10%	20%	21%
Don't know	12%	5%	5%

There is a bill in the California legislature focused on housing development and changing existing zoning policies that applies to the entire state. If passed, SB 6 would allow multifamily housing development projects in areas where multifamily housing was not previously allowed -- in commercially zoned areas reserved for offices and factories. The bill also encourages union bids and union wages on new construction for multifamily housing. The bill makes it easier to quickly build multifamily housing projects by relaxing environmental standards that previously slowed new construction of homes.

Do you approve or disapprove of this bill?

30% Strongly approve
 22% Slightly approve
 13% Slightly disapprove
 21% Strongly disapprove
 15% Don't know

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
Strongly approve	51%	31%	28%	29%	28%
Slightly approve	16%	25%	22%	22%	29%
Slightly disapprove	7%	16%	14%	12%	15%
Strongly disapprove	21%	13%	17%	25%	26%
Don't know	5%	15%	19%	13%	2%

Gender*	Men	Women
Strongly approve	34%	24%
Slightly approve	23%	22%
Slightly disapprove	13%	13%
Strongly disapprove	23%	17%
Don't know	7%	23%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
Strongly approve	30%	29%
Slightly approve	19%	24%
Slightly disapprove	17%	11%
Strongly disapprove	16%	24%
Don't know	19%	12%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
Strongly approve	35%	45%	25%	16%	23%	15%
Slightly approve	27%	15%	19%	22%	26%	24%
Slightly disapprove	14%	6%	19%	13%	14%	14%
Strongly disapprove	6%	16%	26%	38%	28%	38%
Don't know	19%	18%	12%	11%	8%	10%

USC Schwarzenegger Institute-USC Price California Issues Poll
General Election Poll of California Registered Voters, N=802 registered voters
October 30 to November 2 2022. Margin of error +/- 3.5

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
Strongly approve	41%	24%	12%
Slightly approve	26%	24%	12%
Slightly disapprove	10%	14%	16%
Strongly disapprove	7%	25%	45%
Don't know	16%	13%	15%

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
Strongly approve	39%	36%	27%
Slightly approve	26%	20%	21%
Slightly disapprove	11%	17%	12%
Strongly disapprove	8%	15%	25%
Don't know	16%	12%	15%

\

There is a bill in the California legislature that would have allowed the creation of drug-use site pilot programs in the cities of Oakland, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. These sites would allow people to use illegal drugs under supervision in an attempt to prevent overdoses and other safety hazards. Advocates said that this measure would have improved treatment access for drug users and reduced overdoses. Opponents said that the measure would have unintended consequences for public health and safety and could exacerbate illegal activity in nearby areas. Do you approve or disapprove of this bill?

Do you approve or disapprove of this bill?

17% Strongly approve
 19% Slightly approve
 12% Slightly disapprove
 42% Strongly disapprove
 9% Don't know

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
Strongly approve	7%	22%	13%	19%	16%
Slightly approve	6%	22%	18%	20%	21%
Slightly disapprove	29%	8%	17%	10%	13%
Strongly disapprove	56%	39%	38%	44%	49%
Don't know	3%	10%	14%	6%	0%

Gender*	Men	Women
Strongly approve	21%	14%
Slightly approve	20%	19%
Slightly disapprove	9%	17%
Strongly disapprove	45%	37%
Don't know	5%	14%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
Strongly approve	17%	18%
Slightly approve	11%	23%
Slightly disapprove	16%	10%
Strongly disapprove	48%	39%
Don't know	7%	10%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
Strongly approve	24%	22%	13%	4%	16%	13%
Slightly approve	22%	18%	14%	20%	20%	17%
Slightly disapprove	17%	12%	10%	10%	10%	8%
Strongly disapprove	24%	39%	55%	57%	48%	53%
Don't know	12%	8%	8%	8%	6%	8%

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
Strongly approve	27%	12%	5%
Slightly approve	30%	16%	2%
Slightly disapprove	16%	10%	8%
Strongly disapprove	13%	56%	84%
Don't know	15%	6%	1%

USC Schwarzenegger Institute-USC Price California Issues Poll
General Election Poll of California Registered Voters, N=802 registered voters
October 30 to November 2 2022. Margin of error +/- 3.5

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
Strongly approve	29%	22%	15%
Slightly approve	16%	18%	19%
Slightly disapprove	17%	10%	14%
Strongly disapprove	26%	40%	45%
Don't know	12%	10%	8%

California is planning to ban the sale of new gasoline powered cars by 2035. These new regulations would require that 35% of all new passenger cars sold by 2026 to have no emissions. By 2030, 68% of all new passenger cars would be required to have zero emissions.

Do you approve or disapprove of these new car regulations?

32% Strongly approve
 20% Slightly approve
 8% Slightly disapprove
 35% Strongly disapprove
 4% Don't know

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
Strongly approve	23%	27%	33%	34%	16%
Slightly approve	38%	42%	15%	17%	14%
Slightly disapprove	10%	2%	8%	9%	16%
Strongly disapprove	29%	29%	32%	39%	46%
Don't know	0%	0%	12%	1%	9%

Gender*	Men	Women
Strongly approve	40%	24%
Slightly approve	14%	28%
Slightly disapprove	8%	8%
Strongly disapprove	37%	31%
Don't know	1%	9%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
Strongly approve	37%	39%
Slightly approve	27%	21%
Slightly disapprove	10%	7%
Strongly disapprove	18%	30%
Don't know	8%	3%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
Strongly approve	37%	38%	24%	22%	39%	28%
Slightly approve	27%	18%	20%	20%	10%	19%
Slightly disapprove	10%	4%	6%	10%	9%	6%
Strongly disapprove	18%	36%	48%	46%	41%	45%
Don't know	8%	4%	2%	2%	1%	3%

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
Strongly approve	50%	26%	4%
Slightly approve	28%	16%	9%
Slightly disapprove	5%	12%	7%
Strongly disapprove	10%	40%	80%
Don't know	6%	5%	0%

USC Schwarzenegger Institute-USC Price California Issues Poll
General Election Poll of California Registered Voters, N=802 registered voters
October 30 to November 2 2022. Margin of error +/- 3.5

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
Strongly approve	42%	28%	34%
Slightly approve	16%	24%	19%
Slightly disapprove	9%	11%	7%
Strongly disapprove	25%	34%	36%
Don't know	9%	2%	4%

There is a bill in the California legislature that would require the California Air Resources Board to intervene and assert control over the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District if the District does not attain the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) established by the United States Environmental Protection Agency. The San Joaquin Valley region has some of the state's worst air pollution, and proponents of this bill hope it will reduce air pollution. Opponents of this bill say it is unnecessary given existing laws.

Do you approve or disapprove of this bill?

28% Strongly approve
 29% Slightly approve
 11% Slightly disapprove
 18% Strongly disapprove
 15% Don't know

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
Strongly approve	20%	26%	33%	25%	35%
Slightly approve	27%	39%	32%	25%	14%
Slightly disapprove	3%	16%	6%	12%	9%
Strongly disapprove	18%	13%	15%	20%	32%
Don't know	32%	6%	14%	18%	11%

Gender*	Men	Women
Strongly approve	30%	25%
Slightly approve	26%	33%
Slightly disapprove	9%	12%
Strongly disapprove	22%	11%
Don't know	12%	19%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
Strongly approve	26%	28%
Slightly approve	28%	29%
Slightly disapprove	7%	12%
Strongly disapprove	22%	16%
Don't know	16%	15%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
Strongly approve	30%	32%	22%	19%	34%	25%
Slightly approve	37%	30%	27%	26%	16%	20%
Slightly disapprove	13%	3%	13%	13%	11%	9%
Strongly disapprove	5%	20%	23%	27%	24%	28%
Don't know	14%	16%	16%	14%	14%	18%

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
Strongly approve	43%	19%	7%
Slightly approve	35%	31%	15%
Slightly disapprove	5%	14%	18%
Strongly disapprove	1%	24%	46%
Don't know	17%	13%	14%

USC Schwarzenegger Institute-USC Price California Issues Poll
General Election Poll of California Registered Voters, N=802 registered voters
October 30 to November 2 2022. Margin of error +/- 3.5

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
Strongly approve	34%	26%	27%
Slightly approve	20%	37%	29%
Slightly disapprove	14%	4%	12%
Strongly disapprove	12%	17%	18%
Don't know	19%	16%	13%

There is a bill in the California legislature, SB70, that would require children to attend kindergarten before entering first grade at a public school. California currently does not require kindergarten. A number of school districts and education groups support this bill, and a number of home school organizations oppose it.

Do you approve or disapprove of this bill?

35% Strongly approve
 24% Slightly approve
 15% Slightly disapprove
 16% Strongly disapprove
 10% Don't know

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
Strongly approve	31%	24%	43%	34%	19%
Slightly approve	17%	28%	23%	25%	16%
Slightly disapprove	22%	20%	15%	13%	11%
Strongly disapprove	22%	17%	10%	18%	32%
Don't know	7%	10%	9%	11%	22%

Gender*	Men	Women
Strongly approve	31%	40%
Slightly approve	25%	24%
Slightly disapprove	16%	14%
Strongly disapprove	17%	13%
Don't know	11%	9%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
Strongly approve	33%	36%
Slightly approve	28%	22%
Slightly disapprove	15%	15%
Strongly disapprove	14%	16%
Don't know	9%	10%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
Strongly approve	38%	30%	33%	34%	37%	37%
Slightly approve	37%	20%	24%	19%	11%	18%
Slightly disapprove	13%	22%	10%	14%	16%	14%
Strongly disapprove	3%	15%	22%	26%	25%	24%
Don't know	10%	14%	10%	8%	11%	6%

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
Strongly approve	51%	23%	17%
Slightly approve	26%	27%	19%
Slightly disapprove	10%	16%	23%
Strongly disapprove	2%	25%	31%
Don't know	11%	9%	9%

USC Schwarzenegger Institute-USC Price California Issues Poll
General Election Poll of California Registered Voters, N=802 registered voters
October 30 to November 2 2022. Margin of error +/- 3.5

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
Strongly approve	52%	37%	32%
Slightly approve	21%	26%	25%
Slightly disapprove	10%	15%	16%
Strongly disapprove	4%	9%	20%
Don't know	13%	13%	7%

Cross-tabs. attitudes toward voting rights and election law issues before the U.S. Supreme Court

In October 2022, the U.S. Supreme Court considered a case called *Merrill v. Milligan*. This case concerned the rights of Black voters in Alabama though it has implications for the whole country.

This U.S. Supreme Court decision may overturn Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, a federal law that protects minority voting rights in every U.S. state, including California. The Voting Rights Act requires that districts be drawn to protect the voting rights of Asian American, Black, Latino, and Native American voters if there is evidence of racially polarized voting and other guidance is met.

Should the U.S. Supreme Court end Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, or should the U.S. Supreme Court keep the current Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act in place?

16% The US Supreme Court should end Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act
 64% The US Supreme Court should keep Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act
 20% I'm not sure

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
The US Supreme Court should end Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act	9%	17%	17%	15%	33%
The US Supreme Court should keep Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act	71%	59%	62%	66%	49%
I'm not sure	20%	24%	21%	19%	18%

Gender*	Men	Women
The US Supreme Court should end Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act	19%	11%
The US Supreme Court should keep Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act	61%	67%
I'm not sure	19%	21%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
The US Supreme Court should end Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act	12%	18%
The US Supreme Court should keep Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act	60%	66%
I'm not sure	28%	16%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
The US Supreme Court should end Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act	11%	19%	17%	21%	16%	17%
The US Supreme Court should keep Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act	69%	64%	55%	57%	69%	69%
I'm not sure	19%	18%	28%	23%	15%	14%

USC Schwarzenegger Institute-USC Price California Issues Poll
 General Election Poll of California Registered Voters, N=802 registered voters
 October 30 to November 2 2022. Margin of error +/- 3.5

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
The US Supreme Court should end Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act	5%	18%	36%
The US Supreme Court should keep Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act	83%	58%	33%
I'm not sure	12%	23%	32%
Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
The US Supreme Court should end Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act	9%	13%	18%
The US Supreme Court should keep Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act	77%	58%	65%
I'm not sure	13%	29%	17%

If the US Supreme Court ends the Voting Rights Act in *Merrill v. Milligan*, they will announce this decision some time before June 2023.

If the US Supreme Court eliminates Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act for the entire country, should the California legislature pass a bill that enshrines these federal protections of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act for California voters? If California were to pass a state level bill, this might create a three-pronged process for protecting the voting rights of Asian American voters, Black voters, Latino voters, and Native American voters in California during redistricting in those areas of California that have racially polarized voting and where other criteria are met.

Would you support a Voting Rights Act in California that would restore the protections of Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act at the state level?

22% No
 54% Yes
 23% I'm not sure

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
No	9%	21%	23%	22%	41%
Yes	70%	43%	57%	56%	39%
I'm not sure	22%	36%	20%	22%	20%

Gender*	Men	Women
No	26%	17%
Yes	50%	61%
I'm not sure	24%	23%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
No	20%	23%
Yes	49%	57%
I'm not sure	31%	19%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
No	10%	23%	31%	31%	27%	26%
Yes	59%	58%	45%	46%	59%	56%
I'm not sure	31%	20%	24%	23%	14%	18%

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
No	2%	32%	52%
Yes	80%	44%	15%
I'm not sure	18%	25%	33%

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
No	10%	17%	27%
Yes	65%	52%	54%
I'm not sure	24%	31%	19%

In December 2022, the U.S. Supreme Court will consider a case called *Moore v. Harper* about something called the "independent state legislature theory." This theory argues that only state legislators can make rules on elections. If this theory is successful before the U.S. Supreme Court, it could mean voters and citizen commissions would no longer be allowed to make election rules. Right now, in California, voters and citizens' commissions are responsible for making some, but not all, decisions on how elections are run and administered. For example, California voters can currently change election rules by voting on them via ballot propositions; and the California Citizens Redistricting Commission currently redraws lines for legislators instead of allowing the legislators to redraw the lines for congressional districts.

Should the U.S. Supreme Court give power only to the state legislature to make rules about elections, or should the U.S. Supreme Court keep the current rules where voters, Commissions, legislators and others have the right to make rules about elections?

8% The US Supreme Court should overturn the current rules so that only state legislators can make decisions about elections

73% The US Supreme Court should keep the current rules in place so voters and citizen commissions can make decisions about elections

20% I'm not sure

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
The US Supreme Court should overturn the current rules so that only state legislators can make decisions about elections	15%	9%	7%	7%	9%

The US Supreme Court should keep the current rules in place so voters and citizen commissions can make decisions about elections	49%	69%	73%	75%	65%
--	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

I'm not sure	36%	21%	20%	18%	25%
--------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Gender*	Men	Women
The US Supreme Court should overturn the current rules so that only state legislators can make decisions about elections	10%	5%

The US Supreme Court should keep the current rules in place so voters and citizen commissions can make decisions about elections	75%	71%
--	-----	-----

I'm not sure	15%	24%
--------------	-----	-----

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
The US Supreme Court should overturn the current rules so that only state legislators can make decisions about elections	7%	8%

The US Supreme Court should keep the current rules in place so voters and citizen commissions can make decisions about elections	69%	75%
--	-----	-----

I'm not sure	25%	17%
--------------	-----	-----

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
The US Supreme Court should overturn the current rules so that only state legislators can make decisions about elections	2%	15%	11%	9%	3%	8%

The US Supreme Court should keep the current rules in place so voters and citizen commissions can make decisions about elections	73%	66%	69%	71%	84%	79%
--	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

I'm not sure	25%	18%	19%	20%	13%	13%
--------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
The US Supreme Court should overturn the current rules so that only state legislators can make decisions about elections	4%	7%	17%

The US Supreme Court should keep the current rules in place so voters and citizen commissions can make decisions about elections	78%	68%	66%
--	-----	-----	-----

I'm not sure	18%	25%	17%
--------------	-----	-----	-----

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
The US Supreme Court should overturn the current rules so that only state legislators can make decisions about elections	6%	8%	10%

The US Supreme Court should keep the current rules in place so voters and citizen commissions can make decisions about elections	72%	78%	73%
--	-----	-----	-----

I'm not sure	22%	14%	17%
--------------	-----	-----	-----

Cross-tabs. social media and regulation

There has been a lot of talk recently about free speech on social media. Do you think that social media platforms have been too strict on regulating speech, not strict enough, or just right?

39% Too strict
 39% Not strict enough
 22% Just right

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
Too strict	76%	36%	31%	42%	54%
Not strict enough	19%	31%	41%	42%	40%
Just right	5%	33%	27%	16%	7%

Gender*	Men	Women
Too strict	47%	29%
Not strict enough	36%	44%
Just right	17%	27%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
Too strict	47%	35%
Not strict enough	30%	44%
Just right	23%	21%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
Too strict	30%	46%	44%	46%	38%	35%
Not strict enough	28%	44%	38%	41%	50%	56%
Just right	41%	11%	18%	13%	12%	9%

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
Too strict	9%	52%	85%
Not strict enough	58%	33%	9%
Just right	33%	16%	6%

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
Too strict	38%	34%	40%
Not strict enough	25%	41%	45%
Just right	37%	25%	15%

Elon Musk recently bought Twitter and promises to change who can use the platform and what people can say on the Twitter.

Do you approve or disapprove of Elon Musk buying Twitter?

32% Strongly approve
 9% Slightly approve
 13% Slightly disapprove
 33% Strongly disapprove
 12% I don't have an opinion
 1% I didn't know about this

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
Strongly approve	36%	27%	27%	35%	36%
Slightly approve	13%	19%	8%	6%	7%
Slightly disapprove	2%	15%	17%	11%	4%
Strongly disapprove	24%	27%	32%	36%	26%
Don't have an opinion	26%	8%	15%	11%	26%
Didn't know	0%	4%	0%	1%	0%

Gender*	Men	Women
Strongly approve	38%	22%
Slightly approve	10%	7%
Slightly disapprove	11%	15%
Strongly disapprove	30%	37%
Don't have an opinion	8%	17%
Didn't know	1%	1%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
Strongly approve	34%	30%
Slightly approve	8%	9%
Slightly disapprove	17%	11%
Strongly disapprove	30%	35%
Don't have an opinion	10%	14%
Didn't know	1%	1%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
Strongly approve	19%	37%	40%	38%	37%	28%
Slightly approve	11%	5%	11%	7%	7%	10%
Slightly disapprove	24%	7%	7%	13%	10%	8%
Strongly disapprove	34%	40%	27%	25%	37%	36%
Don't have an opinion	12%	9%	13%	16%	10%	18%
Didn't know	0%	2%	2%	1%	0%	1%

USC Schwarzenegger Institute-USC Price California Issues Poll
 General Election Poll of California Registered Voters, N=802 registered voters
 October 30 to November 2 2022. Margin of error +/- 3.5

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
Strongly approve	3%	46%	72%
Slightly approve	7%	7%	15%
Slightly disapprove	19%	8%	6%
Strongly disapprove	53%	27%	1%
Don't have an opinion	16%	10%	7%
Didn't know	1%	1%	0%

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
Strongly approve	23%	27%	36%
Slightly approve	10%	7%	8%
Slightly disapprove	24%	12%	11%
Strongly disapprove	33%	32%	33%
Don't have an opinion	10%	18%	12%
Didn't know	0%	4%	0%

Cross-tabs, Ballot propositions:

In the November election, California voters are asked to weigh in on a number of ballot initiatives. A ballot initiative (also called a ballot measure or proposition) is a proposed law that California voters can directly decide whether to enact. In the next section, we will be asking you for your opinion on each of these measures. Do your best to think about how you might vote on Election Day. If you do not plan to vote for a ballot proposition, just do not answer that question and move on to the next question.

Proposition 1. Constitutional Right to Reproductive Freedom. Legislative Constitutional Amendment Amends California Constitution to expressly include an individual's fundamental right to reproductive freedom, which includes the fundamental right to choose to have an abortion and the fundamental right to choose or refuse contraceptives. This amendment does not narrow or limit the existing rights to privacy and equal protection under the California Constitution. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect because reproductive rights already are protected by state law. Would you vote for this proposition?

68% Yes
 32% No

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
% Yes	80%	67%	67%	69%	40%
% No	20%	33%	33%	31%	60%

Gender*	Men	Women
% Yes	63%	74%
% No	36%	26%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
% Yes	61%	72%
% No	39%	28%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
% Yes	77%	72%	63%	57%	63%	63%
% No	23%	28%	37%	43%	37%	37%

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
% Yes	93%	63%	79%
% No	7%	37%	21%

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
% Yes	74%	64%	68%
% No	26%	36%	32%

Proposition 26. Allows In-Person Roulette, Dice Games, Sports Wagering on Tribal Lands. Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute. Also allows: sports wagering at certain horseracing tracks; private lawsuits to enforce gambling laws. Directs revenues to General Fund, problem-gambling programs, enforcement. Fiscal Impact: Increased state revenues, possibly reaching tens of millions of dollars annually. Some of these revenues would support increased state regulatory and enforcement costs that could reach the low tens of millions of dollars annually. Would you vote for this proposition?

38% Yes
 62% No

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
Yes	36%	30%	48%	36%	26%
No	64%	70%	52%	64%	74%

Gender*	Men	Women
Yes	44%	32%
No	56%	68%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
Yes	34%	41%
No	66%	59%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
Yes	40%	58%	42%	30%	22%	19%
No	60%	42%	58%	70%	78%	81%

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
Yes	40%	42%	32%
No	60%	58%	68%

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
Yes	44%	64%	41%
No	56%	36%	59%

Proposition 27. Allows Online and Mobile Sports Wagering Outside Tribal Lands. Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute. Allows Indian tribes and affiliated businesses to operate online/mobile sports wagering outside tribal lands. Directs revenues to regulatory costs, homelessness programs, nonparticipating tribes. Fiscal Impact: Increased state revenues, possibly in the hundreds of millions of dollars but not likely to exceed \$500 million annually. Some revenues would support state regulatory costs, possibly reaching the mid-tens of millions of dollars annually. Would you vote for this proposition?

30% Yes
 70% No

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
Yes	38%	30%	35%	28%	26%
No	62%	70%	65%	72%	74%

Gender*	Men	Women
Yes	30%	22%
No	66%	72%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
Yes	30%	30%
No	70%	70%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
Yes	29%	39%	31%	17%	11%	13%
No	71%	61%	69%	83%	89%	87%

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
Yes	25%	35%	32%
No	75%	65%	68%

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
Yes	34%	30%	28%
No	66%	70%	72%

Proposition 28. Provides Additional Funding for Arts and Music Education in Public Schools. Initiative Statute. Provides additional funding from state General Fund for arts and music education in all K-12 public schools (including charter schools). Fiscal Impact: Increased state costs of about \$1 billion annually, beginning next year, for arts education in public schools. Would you vote for this proposition?

69% Yes
 31% No

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
Yes	71%	70%	73%	67%	59%
No	29%	30%	27%	33%	41%

Gender*	Men	Women
Yes	65%	74%
No	35%	26%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
Yes	62%	73%
No	38%	27%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
Yes	78%	81%	61%	53%	61%	68%
No	22%	19%	39%	47%	39%	32%

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
Yes	88%	63%	36%
No	12%	37%	64%

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
Yes	83%	70%	67%
No	17%	30%	33%

Proposition 30. Provides Funding for Programs to Reduce Air Pollution and Prevent Wildfires By Increasing Tax on Personal Income Over \$2 Million. Initiative Statute. Allocates tax revenues to zero-emission vehicle purchase incentives, vehicle charging stations, and wildfire prevention. Fiscal Impact: Increased state tax revenue ranging from \$3.5 billion to \$5 billion annually, with the new funding used to support zero-emission vehicle programs and wildfire response and prevention activities. Would you vote for this proposition?

53% Yes
 47% No

Race/ethnicity:	Asian	Black	Latino	White	Other/Multiracial
Yes	64%	68%	57%	47%	44%
No	36%	32%	43%	53%	56%

Gender*	Men	Women
Yes	48%	60%
No	52%	40%

*Note: Some respondents also indicated they were non-binary or transgender, but the sample sizes are too small for these groups for reliable survey estimates.

Education:	Less than BA	BA college degree or higher
Yes	45%	57%
No	55%	43%

Age:	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	>70
Yes	65%	62%	48%	42%	40%	40%
No	35%	38%	52%	58%	60%	60%

Party:	Dem.	Ind.	Rep.
Yes	73%	42%	25%
No	27%	58%	75%

Income:	<50k	\$50-99k	>\$100
Yes	69%	56%	50%
No	31%	44%	50%

About the researchers behind the USC Schwarzenegger-USC Price California Issues Poll

Dr. Christian R. Grose is Professor of Public Policy in USC Price and Professor of Political Science and International Relations in USC Dornsife at the University of Southern California. He is also Principal of his own political and policy data firm, which provides consulting services for data analysis and data science regarding surveys, polls, racially polarized voting, voting rights, and political and electoral data. Dr. Grose can be reached at cgrose@usc.edu or cgrose123456@gmail.com.

Raquel Centeno is a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Southern California. Her research examines the causes and consequences of partisan polarization among voters in the United States; and how attitudes toward polarization and partisanship differ across Black, Latino, Asian, and non-Hispanic white voters. Raquel can be reached at racenten@usc.edu.

Bijean Ghafouri is a Ph.D. student at the University of Southern California. His research examines how disinformation affects attitudes about politics.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the students who participate in the USC Schwarzenegger Institute Democracy Lab for taking part in the development and design of the poll and questions, and the entire team at the USC Schwarzenegger Institute and at USC Price. We would also like to thank Political Data, Inc. for providing the voter file from which the survey sample was drawn; and Allison Kay and Conyers Davis at the USC Schwarzenegger Institute.