

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
September 12-25, 2024  
Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
University of Southern California  
Cal Poly Pomona  
MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

## The California Elections and Policy Poll (CEPP): Statewide Poll of the California Electorate, poll conducted September 12-25, 2024

The California Elections and Policy Poll (CEPP) is a statewide representative survey of California likely voters. These survey results are a snapshot of the California electorate's opinions and attitudes on the days in which the polls were fielded and may not reflect changes to voter opinions and attitudes that occur between now and Election Day.

The poll asked about vote choices for 2024 U.S. president, 2024 U.S. Senate, 2024 ballot propositions, the 2026 governor's race, the 2026 lieutenant governor's race, several public policies before the legislature in 2024 or that may be on the agenda in 2025-26, the state of the economy, crime, and the 2028 Olympics. The poll of the state of California also asked respondents to briefly describe in open-ended responses the word or words that come to mind when thinking about the major party presidential and vice presidential candidates. Sampling and weighting were done at the state level to ensure the poll is representative. Results are presented for likely voters. The statewide poll has a sample size (N) of 1685 likely voters. The margin of error (MoE) for the state poll is +/-2.4. The poll of L.A. County voters has a sample size (N) of 311 likely voters and a margin of error for the L.A. County-specific questions of +/-5.6. For additional methodological details, see the statement of methodology below. Toplines and crosstabs may not sum to 100% due to rounding or because all response options are not displayed in the crosstabs.

The poll is conducted by a team including Dr. Christian Grose (University of Southern California); Dr. Matthew Mendez Garcia (CSU, Long Beach); Raquel Centeno (University of Southern California); Dr. Jarred Cuellar (Cal Poly Pomona); Dr. Matt Lesenyie (CSU, Long Beach); Jose Alcocer (University of Southern California); Aloe Villagrana (CSU, Long Beach); and Alex Wong (University of Southern California).

**English-language media Inquiries:** Please contact Dr. Christian Grose, at [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu), [drchristiangrose@gmail.com](mailto:drchristiangrose@gmail.com), and 818-277-6789. Please also contact Dr. Matt Lesenyie at [Matt.Lesenyie@csulb.edu](mailto:Matt.Lesenyie@csulb.edu).

**Spanish-language media Inquiries:** Please contact Jose Alcocer at [alcocer@usc.edu](mailto:alcocer@usc.edu) or Dr. Jarred Cuellar at [jrcuellar@cpp.edu](mailto:jrcuellar@cpp.edu).

Summary of topline findings from the California Elections and Policy Poll of California likely voters:

**1. Kamala Harris is easily beating Donald Trump in California. Harris is also polling better in California now compared to Biden’s performance in our last statewide poll. Harris has about 5 percentage points more support from the California electorate than Biden did earlier this year (when undecided voters are pushed to choose a candidate).** In this September 2024 poll, the Harris-Walz ticket receives 56.5% of the vote to Trump-Vance at 33.7%. When undecideds are pushed to decide, the Harris-Walz numbers increase to 57.7% and for Trump-Vance increase to 35.5%. In a [statewide poll](#) we conducted earlier this year when Joe Biden was the presumptive Democratic nominee, Biden received only 53% of support from California voters. Harris is polling almost 5 percentage points better, when undecideds are pushed, than Biden was in spring of this year.

**2. Democrat Adam Schiff maintains a large lead over Republican Steve Garvey in the race for the U.S. Senate. In the state, 52.7% of California likely voters support Adam Schiff while 33.8% of likely voters support Steve Garvey.** Only about 12% of voters are undecided, and this election lead for Schiff is well outside of the margin of error. The large leads for Harris and Schiff statewide may provide a boost for down ballot Democrats.

**3. This poll was conducted right before the 2024 vice presidential debate. On the eve of the VP debate, Californians’ opinions of J.D. Vance are quite negative while the words used to describe Tim Walz are more positive or mixed.** Voters were asked to describe the vice presidential candidates in one word or phrase using open-ended comments. When asked to describe VP candidate Tim Walz, the most commonly used words were “Coach/Teacher” (7.7% of likely voters), “Kind” (5.9%), and “Honest” (5.4%). In contrast, the three words most frequently used to describe J.D. Vance by California likely voters are “Liar” (11.1%), “Opportunist” (8.4%), and “Misogynist” (5.2%). Vance is clearly viewed negatively by the majority of the California electorate.

**4. California voters have negative views of Donald Trump, while the same voters have polarized views of Kamala Harris.** When California voters are asked to describe Trump, most of the unprompted mentions are negative. The most frequent descriptions of Trump are “Narcissist” (14.2%), “Liar” (12.5%), “Criminal” (5.7%), and “Dangerous” (5.4%). The most common positive mention was

“Businessman/good at business/real estate” (3.7%). For Harris, she was most frequently described in open-ended comments as “Strong” (9.7%), “Competent” (8.7%), “Incompetent” (7.7%), and “Liar” (6.0%). Voters have strong ways of describing both major-party presidential candidates with Trump defined quite negatively.

**5. When considering *only* those candidates who have formally announced a run for California Governor for the 2026 election, Antonio Villaraigosa (Democrat, former mayor of Los Angeles) places first. Eleni Kounalakis (Democrat, Lt. Governor) and Betty Yee (Democrat, former State Controller) are tied for second.** When voters consider all five major candidates who have formally announced a run for 2026 Governor, Villaraigosa is supported by 7.6% of likely voters and Kounalakis and Yee are each supported by 4.5% of likely voters (all three are thus within the margin of error). A whopping 61% of voters are undecided and do not yet know who they will choose in the 2026 Governor’s election when asked to vote for one of these declared gubernatorial candidates.

**6. When we ask about *both* declared candidates for 2026 Governor and candidates rumored to be considering a run, the top vote getter is Democrat Rep. Katie Porter. The Democrat who receives the second-most support among Democrats is Attorney General Rob Bonta. Among Republicans, Brian Dahle (2022 candidate for Governor), Chad Bianco (Riverside County Sheriff), and Steve Hilton (FOX News host) all receive the most support from California voters.** Katie Porter is clearly ahead of the pack, receiving 14.0% of the vote for 2026 Governor, when matched against more than 10 people who have announced they are running or are rumored to be running for Governor. In second place is Republican Brian Dahle with 5.3%, followed by Republican Chad Bianco at 4.7%, Republican Steve Hilton at 4.0%, Democrat Rob Bonta at 3.5%, and Democrat Xavier Becerra at 2.9%. Close behind them and effectively tied with this behind-Porter group are Democrats Rick Caruso, Eleni Kounalakis, Antonio Villaraigosa, and Betty Yee. The support levels for all candidates are low, which means voters have not made up their minds about Governor in 2026. In fact, even with this crowded field, about half the electorate is undecided.

**7. We also polled the two candidates who have announced a run for Lt. Governor in 2026. In a Democrat-versus-Democrat contest, Fiona Ma leads Stephen Bradford outside of the margin of error.** With Ma getting only 14.9% and Bradford getting only 5.0% of the vote in this poll, most voters are undecided. Fiona Ma is California’s State Treasurer, and Stephen Bradford is a California State Senator.

**8. George Gascón is losing badly in his reelection campaign for L.A. County District Attorney. We also conducted a poll of likely voters in L.A. County as part of this broader statewide poll. In the election for the next District Attorney in Los Angeles County, Nathan Hochman has a significant lead. Hochman is garnering support from 44.4% of L.A. County likely voters, while Gascón receives support from 20.3% of L.A. County likely voters.** About one-third of voters remain undecided. Notably, Gascón support has not grown since the March primary, where he received about 25% of the vote. Hochman, in contrast, has grown his support from the primary where he received 16% of the vote. Our pre-primary poll in January 2024 and this September 2024 general election poll also shows Hochman making up ground with several key subgroups.

**9. L.A. County likely voters support reform to the Board of Supervisors. The proposal to create an elected County Executive and to increase the number of L.A. County Board of Supervisor districts from 5 to 9 is favored by 35.6% of likely voters in the county. This reform proposal is opposed by 17.4% of likely voters.** However, just under half of voters have not made their minds up on this L.A. County governance reform, and so it is possible for either “Yes” or “No” to prevail in November if the undecided voters break in one direction.

**10. An artificial intelligence (AI) safety bill (SB1047) sponsored by Senator Scott Wiener is popular among California’s voters. More than half (56.9%) of the state’s likely voters support this AI safety policy proposal, and only 14.7% oppose (with the rest saying they don’t know if they support or oppose).** This bill seeks to regulate AI by requiring some large AI models above a set cost and size threshold to adopt safety steps. Supporters say this bill will help create regulatory safeguards against AI in the future, while opponents say the bill will hurt innovation and cause tech jobs to move out of state. This bill has seen significant opposition from some Democratic members of Congress in California, though many Democrats in the state legislature supported the legislation. When we asked the question, we described the bill and noted arguments from both proponents and opponents.

**11. Governor Gavin Newsom’s recent executive order to direct state agencies to clear homeless encampments and provide assistance to individuals living in them is very popular.** Almost three-quarters of California voters (72.0%) approve of Newsom’s decision, and few disapprove (only 15.1%).

**12. As Governor Newsom’s term reaches its final two years, the state’s voters are evenly split on whether they would support him in the future, were he not term limited. A significant minority of the state’s voters would vote for Gavin Newsom for Governor again if he were not term limited, but a slightly larger group say they would not vote for him again even if they could.** We asked California likely voters: “Governor Gavin Newsom is term limited and cannot run again in 2026. If Newsom were allowed to run, would you vote for him for Governor?” About 47% of voters say they would vote for Newsom again if they could, and about 53% say they would not.

**13. Several ballot propositions – Prop 2 (bonds for schools), Prop 3 (gay marriage), and Prop 4 (bonds for the environment) have strong support among California likely voters.** Prop 2, which authorizes bonds for public school and community college facilities, has support from over half of likely voters. Prop 3, which enshrines the right to marriage, including for LGBTQ people, is supported by 65.7% of likely voters. Prop 4 authorizes bonds for safe drinking water, wildfire prevention, and other climate matters and is supported by 60.4% of voters.

**14. Voters are fairly split on whether to pass Prop 5, which would make it easier to raise taxes in order to build housing in localities.** Prop 5 would allow approval of infrastructure and local housing bonds with a 55% vote. Currently, a two-thirds vote is required to make these changes. The poll finds that 43.3% of voters support Prop 5 and 35.2% oppose. This support level, relative to the percentage of voters opposing, is a bit higher than seen in other recent statewide polls. However, a large swath of voters remain undecided (21.5%) and undecided voters often break toward the “No” side when voting on ballot propositions. Homeowners show more opposition to Prop 5, breaking 35.5% supporting and 43.3% opposed. In contrast, 54.3% of renters support this proposition and 25.2% oppose. Just over 20% of both owners and renters are undecided.

**15. Prop 33: The ballot proposition to repeal Costa-Hawkins, which would change rent control regulations, is nearly tied. Just over one-third of voters (37.1%) favor the repeal, while one-third oppose (33.3%).** A large percentage are undecided, which means this ballot proposition could go either way. Homeowners are somewhat less likely to support the repeal of Costa-Hawkins than renters, according to our poll. Voters under age 40 support Prop 33 by a large margin (43.0% to 23.5% with 33.4% undecided), while voters over the age of 60 are opposed to this proposition (31.3% yes, 42.4% no, 26.3% undecided). Voters aged 40-60 are evenly split with 35.1% yes, 36.9% no, and 28.0% undecided.

**16. Californians perceive that crime is up in the state. Voters also strongly favor Prop 36, which would allow felony charges for possessing certain drugs and for thefts under \$950.** 57.9% of likely voters say they will vote for Prop 36 to increase criminal penalties for petty theft and drug use, while only 19.0% oppose. We also asked if California voters perceived that crime is higher or lower than last year and 27.2% said crime in the state is “at historic highs” and another 24.5% said it was higher than last year. Only 4.7% of voters said crime was at historic lows and 26.9% perceived that crime had dropped in the state since last year. Those with perceptions of higher crime strongly support Prop 36: 82.7% of those who think crime is “At historic highs” will vote yes and 8.9% will vote no. Of those who think crime is higher than last year, 69.2% intend to vote yes on Prop 36 and 9.7% intend to vote no.

**17. A proposed government loan program for undocumented immigrants is unpopular with Californians. A legislative proposal for social or public housing receives mixed reviews from California likely voters.** Governor Newsom vetoed a bill passed by the state legislature that would provide up to \$150,000 in state-supported home loans for undocumented immigrants. This policy proposal is supported by only 19.1% of likely voters, and opposed by 65.7%. Another bill proposed in the legislature would create a public agency to increase construction of public or social housing. This bill is opposed by 40.4% of California likely voters and supported by 37.5% of California likely voters.

**18. California likely voters are not particularly supportive of programs for people experiencing homelessness that come with no strings attached, and these voters are concerned that “housing first” programs are ineffective.** Voters do not favor programs for those experiencing homelessness if they come without any conditions such as therapy or counseling for substance abuse. More than half of voters do not favor such a program, with 33.8% strongly not in favor and 17.6% strongly not

in favor. In a different question, when asked about “housing first” policies, only 11.1% think these policies are very effective and 24.8% think these policies are very ineffective.

**18. A majority of California likely voters would like to see Donald Trump step aside, in part due to the fact that he is similar in age to Joe Biden.** When asked “Do you think Donald Trump should be replaced with a different Republican presidential nominee?” slightly more than half of the state’s voters said yes, while about 40% said no. When reminded that Trump is nearly the same age as Biden, 14% of Republican voters, 74% of Democratic voters, and 48% of independent voters want to see Trump replaced as the Republican nominee.

Polling methodology for Statewide California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP): The sample size for the entire statewide survey was 1,685 likely voters; and margin of error for the entire survey is +/-2.4. There was also a L.A. County sample only, and the sample size for this part of the survey is 311 likely voters with a margin of error of +/-5.6.<sup>1</sup>

Within the poll, voters were randomly sampled from the list of voters in the state (relying upon the California voter file), ensuring equal probability of participation for all voters in the state; and to provide representativeness of the state’s electorate. Then, voters were screened for those who said they were “very likely” or “somewhat likely” to vote. The survey was fielded by email to all sampled voters using an online survey platform. For the poll, once all survey data were collected, for greater precision and accuracy, we calculated and used survey weights that are standard in the field to adjust for observable non-response. For the statewide poll, these weights were calculated for each individual respondent based on representative data on voters in the state of California in a presidential election year. These survey weights were used in calculating the topline and crosstab results of the statewide poll. This method makes the polling results representative of the 2024 likely voter electorate in the state of California. Survey weighting included party, past voting behavior, and demographic variables (gender, race/ethnicity, age) within each district. A raking procedure using the anesrake method in the statistical program R was conducted to compute the weights. The polling was conducted by Data Viewpoint for the CSU-Long Beach Urban Politics and Policy Center in partnership with USC and Cal Poly Pomona. The surveys were fielded in English, Spanish, Korean, Mandarin/Chinese, and Vietnamese.

---

<sup>1</sup> There are larger margins of error for subsamples and crosstabs – these are the topline sample sizes and margins of error.



Questions asked in California Election & Policy Poll (statewide, n=1685 LVs)

Over the last year, would you say local economic conditions in your area are getting better or worse?

14.8% Better  
53.3% Worse  
29.4% About the same  
2.5% I'm not sure / don't know

Over the last year, would you say California's economic conditions are getting better or worse?

16.3% Better  
60.1% Worse  
20.2% About the same  
3.4% I'm not sure / don't know

Over the last year, would you say national economic conditions are getting better or worse?

28.0% Better  
54.0% Worse  
15.5% About the same  
2.5% I'm not sure / don't know

Do you consider yourself a Democrat, Republican, independent or something else?

46.8% Democrat  
25.2% Republican  
28.0% Independent/something else/other party

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
September 12-25, 2024  
Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
University of Southern California  
Cal Poly Pomona  
MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

All likely voters: Thinking ahead to the 2024 November general election, who do you plan to vote for president and vice president?

56.5% Kamala Harris and Tim Walz (Democrat)  
33.7% Donald Trump and J.D. Vance (Republican)  
1.1% Robert Kennedy Jr. and Nicole Shanahan (American Independent)  
<1% Chase Oliver and Mike ter Maat (Libertarian)  
1.5% Jill Stein and Rudolph Ware (Green)  
<1% Claudia de la Cruz and Karina Garcia (Peace and Freedom)  
6.2% Don't know  
<1% % I will skip this election

Only those undecided on US president: Even though you said you didn't know who you plan to vote for in the US presidential election, if you were forced to choose, who would you vote for? [asked only to those answering 'Don't know' to above vote choice question to measure undecided leaners]

20.3% Kamala Harris and Tim Walz (Democrat)  
28.0% Donald Trump and J.D. Vance (Republican)  
<1% Chase Oliver and Mike ter Maat (Libertarian)  
9.3% Robert Kennedy Jr. and Nicole Shanahan (American Independent)  
<1% Jill Stein and Rudolph Ware (Green)  
<1% Claudia de la Cruz and Karina Garcia (Peace and Freedom)  
42.3% I really don't know

All likely voters with undecided presidential leaners: Combining responses to "Thinking ahead to the 2024 November general election, who do you plan to vote for president and vice president?" and "don't know" leaners' responses to branch question "Even though you said you didn't know who you plan to vote for in the US presidential election, if you were forced to choose, who would you vote for?"

57.7% Kamala Harris and Tim Walz (Democrat)  
35.5% Donald Trump and J.D. Vance (Republican)  
1.7% Robert Kennedy Jr. and Nicole Shanahan (American Independent)  
<1% Chase Oliver and Mike ter Maat (Libertarian)  
1.5% Jill Stein and Rudolph Ware (Green)  
<1% Claudia de la Cruz and Karina Garcia (Peace and Freedom)  
2.6% I really don't know  
<1% I will skip this election

Thinking ahead to the 2024 November general election, who do you plan to vote for to be US Senator?

52.7% Adam Schiff (Democrat)  
33.8% Steve Garvey (Republican)  
12.6% Don't know  
0.9% I will skip this election

Only those undecided on US Senate: Even though you said you didn't know who you plan to vote for in the US Senate election, if you were forced to choose, who would you vote for? [asked only to those answering 'Don't know' to above vote choice question to measure undecided leaners]

29.9% Adam Schiff (Democrat)  
21.5% Steve Garvey (Republican)  
48.6% I really don't know

US Senate: All likely voters with undecided Senate leaners: Combining responses to "Thinking ahead to the 2024 November general election, who do you plan to vote for to be US Senator?" and "don't know" leaners' responses to branch question "Even though you said you didn't know who you plan to vote for in the US Senate election, if you were forced to choose, who would you vote for?"

56.4% Adam Schiff (Democrat)  
36.5% Steve Garvey (Republican)  
6.1% I really don't know  
1.0% I will skip this election

Thinking ahead to the 2024 November general election, who do you plan to vote for to be US House Representative?

53.0% Democratic candidate  
34.3% Republican candidate  
12.3% Don't know  
<1% I will skip this election

In the November 2020 U.S. presidential election, who did you support?

61.4% Joe Biden (Democrat)  
33.4% Donald Trump (Republican)  
5.2% Didn't vote / Someone else / I don't remember

What word or words come to mind when you think of Kamala Harris? Please write the word or words below. If you are not sure, you can just write "Don't know" or skip this question.

9.7% Strong  
8.7% Competent  
7.7% Incompetent  
6.0% Liar  
4.9% Fake  
4.0% Capable  
3.4% Progressive  
3.4% Woman  
3.2% Qualified  
3.0% Dishonest  
3.0% Unqualified  
<3% All other open-ended comments  
[these percentages excluded those who said don't know or did not answer; or open-ended responses that were stated by less than 1% of respondents]

What word or words come to mind when you think of Donald Trump? Please write the word or words below. If you are not sure, you can just write "Don't know" or skip this question.

- 14.2% Narcissist
- 12.5% Liar
- 5.7% Criminal
- 5.4% Dangerous
- 4.8% Racist
- 4.5% Con man/Grifter/Grifting
- 3.7% Businessman/Good at business/real estate
- 3.6% Corrupt
- 3.5% Leader
- 3.3% Patriot/Patriotic
- 3.3% Selfish
- 3.2% Egomaniac/Big ego
- 3.1% Dictator
- 3.0% America First/MAGA
- 3.0% Strong
- <3% All other open-ended comments

[these percentages excluded those who said don't know or did not answer; or open-ended responses that were stated by less than 1% of respondents]

What word or words come to mind when you think of Tim Walz? Please write the word or words below. If you are not sure, you can just write "Don't know" or skip this question.

7.7% Coach/Teacher

5.9% Kind

5.4% Honest

5.2% Down to Earth

4.5% Liar

4.2% Socialist

4.2% Caring

4.2% Compassionate

3.5% Midwestern

3.1% Competent

3.1% Communist

3.1% Genuine

<3% All other open-ended comments

[these percentages excluded those who said don't know or did not answer; or open-ended responses that were stated by less than 1% of respondents]

What word or words come to mind when you think of J.D. Vance? Please write the word or words below. If you are not sure, you can just write "Don't know" or skip this question.

- 11.1% Liar
- 8.4% Opportunist
- 5.2% Misogynist
- 4.9% Dangerous
- 4.7% Intelligent
- 4.4% Patriot
- 4.2% Dishonest
- 4.2% Racist
- 4.2% Weird
- 3.5% Evil
- 3.5% Sycophant
- 3.2% Expletives
- 3.2% Untrustworthy
- 3.0% Fake/phony
- <3% All other open-ended comments

[these percentages excluded those who said don't know or did not answer; or open-ended responses that were stated by less than 1% of respondents]

How excited are you about the upcoming November election?

- 36.7% Very excited
- 27.6% Somewhat excited
- 12.6% Somewhat not excited
- 20.2% Very not excited
- 2.9% Don't know

[Note: The next two questions were asked of all, but were randomly ordered]

California will elect a Governor in 2026. The following candidates have **announced they are running.**

If the election for Governor were held today, which one of the following candidates would you vote for?

- 7.6% Antonio Villaraigosa (Democrat)
- 4.5% Eleni Kounalakis (Democrat)
- 4.5% Betty Yee (Democrat)
- 2.7% Toni Atkins (Democrat)
- 2.6% Tony Thurmond (Democrat)
- 16.5% I would skip this election
- 61.6% Don't know

California will elect a Governor in 2026. The list of candidates below **includes people who are rumored to be considering a run for Governor and people who have announced they are running** for Governor.

If the election for Governor were held today, which one of the following candidates would you vote for?

- 14.0% Katie Porter (Democrat)
- 5.3% Brian Dahle (Republican)
- 4.7% Chad Bianco (Republican)
- 4.0% Steve Hilton (Republican)
- 3.5% Rob Bonta (Democrat)
- 2.9% Xavier Becerra (Democrat)
- 2.6% Rick Caruso (Democrat)
- 2.6% Antonio Villaraigosa (Democrat)
- 2.6% Betty Yee (Democrat)
- 2.1% Eleni Kounalakis (Democrat)
- 1.7% Lanhee Chen (Republican)
- 1.3% Toni Atkins (Democrat)
- 1.3% Tony Thurmond (Democrat)
- 1.7% I would skip this election
- 49.7% Don't know



California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
September 12-25, 2024  
Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
University of Southern California  
Cal Poly Pomona  
MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Governor Gavin Newsom is term limited and cannot run again in 2026. If Newsom were allowed to run, would you vote for him for Governor?

20.2% Would definitely vote for Newsom  
26.9% Might vote for Newsom  
10.7% Might not vote for Newsom  
42.3% Would definitely not vote for Newsom

California will elect a Lieutenant Governor in 2026. Only two candidates have announced so far. If the election for Lieutenant Governor were held today, which one of the following candidates would you vote for?

14.9% Fiona Ma (Democrat)  
5.0% Stephen Bradford (Democrat)  
17.7% I would skip this election  
62.3% Don't know

There is a bill to regulate artificial intelligence (AI) in California's state legislature. This bill would require some large AI models—above a set cost and size threshold—to adopt safety steps. Supporters of the bill say this will protect people from AI in the future by creating a killswitch and other protections, while opponents say the bill will hurt innovation and cause tech and AI jobs to move out of state.

Do you support or oppose this bill?

56.9% Support  
14.7% Oppose  
28.4% Don't know

California Governor Gavin Newsom recently issued an executive order directing state agencies to move urgently to remove dangerous homeless encampments while supporting and assisting the individuals living in them. The executive order also provided guidance for cities and counties to immediately begin removing homeless encampments following a court decision making it easier to do so in California.

Do you approve or disapprove of this executive order?

72.0% Approve  
15.1% Disapprove  
12.9% Don't know

A policy proposal would allow undocumented immigrants in California to be eligible for up to \$150,000 in state-supported home loans for first-time home buyers.

Do you support or oppose this policy proposal?

19.1% Support  
65.7% Oppose  
15.3% Don't know

Should there be age limits to serve as president?

68.4% Yes  
23.4% No  
8.2% Don't know

A bill proposed in the California legislature would create a public agency to develop housing directly paid for by taxpayers, which would lead to an increase in construction of new public housing and social housing.

Do you support or oppose this policy proposal?

37.5% Support  
40.4% Oppose  
22.1% Don't know

Housing First policies seek to place individuals experiencing homelessness in temporary or permanent housing to get them off the streets and connect them to support services. How effective do you think these policies are in reducing the number of people experiencing homelessness?

11.1% Very effective  
36.0% Somewhat effective  
18.4% Somewhat ineffective  
24.8% Very ineffective  
9.7% Don't know

Do you favor programs that offer 'people experiencing homelessness' services without any conditions such as therapy or counseling for substance abuse?

20.2% Strongly favor  
20.7% Somewhat favor  
17.6% Somewhat not favor  
33.8% Strongly not favor  
7.7% Don't know

Now, we'd like to ask you about several ballot propositions before voters in California this November. [note: The text of the question reflects the exact language on the ballot according to the Secretary of State. All ballot proposition questions randomized 'Yes' and 'No' in the response options]

Ballot proposition 2 authorizes bonds for public school and community college facilities.

**Summary of Prop 2:** Authorizes \$10 billion in general obligation bonds for repair, upgrade, and construction of facilities at K–12 public schools (including charter schools), community colleges, and career technical education programs, including for improvement of health and safety conditions and classroom upgrades. Requires annual audits. Fiscal Impact: Increased state costs of about \$500 million annually for 35 years to repay the bond. Supporters: California Teachers Association; California School Nurses Organization; Community College League of California. Opponents: Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association.

Will you vote for this ballot proposition?

54.0% Yes  
28.5% No  
17.5% Don't know / not sure

Ballot proposition 3 creates a state constitutional right to marriage.

**Summary of Prop 3:** Amends California Constitution to recognize fundamental right to marry, regardless of sex or race. Removes language in California Constitution stating that marriage is only between a man and a woman. Fiscal Impact: No change in revenues or costs for state and local governments. Supporters: Sierra Pacific Synod of The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; Dolores Huerta Foundation; Equality California. Opponents: Jonathan Keller, California Family Council; Rev. Tanner DiBella.

Will you vote for this ballot proposition?

65.7% Yes  
24.1% No  
10.2% Don't know / not sure

Ballot proposition 4 authorizes bonds for safe drinking water, wildfire prevention, and protecting communities and natural lands from climate risks.

**Summary of Prop 4:** Authorizes \$10 billion in general obligation bonds for water, wildfire prevention, and protection of communities and lands. Requires annual audits. Fiscal Impact: Increased state costs of about \$400 million annually for 40 years to repay the bond. Supporters: Clean Water Action; CALFIRE Firefighters; National Wildlife Federation; The Nature Conservancy. Opponents: Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association.

Will you vote for this ballot proposition?

60.4% Yes  
24.1% No  
15.5% Don't know / not sure

Ballot proposition 5 allows local bonds for affordable housing and public infrastructure with 55% voter approval.

**Summary of Prop 5:** Allows approval of local infrastructure and housing bonds for low- and middle-income Californians with 55% vote. Fiscal Impact: Increased local borrowing to fund affordable housing, supportive housing, and public infrastructure. The amount would depend on decisions by local governments and voters. Borrowing would be repaid with higher property taxes. Supporters: California Professional Firefighters; League of Women Voters of California; Habitat for Humanity California. Opponents: California Taxpayers Association; California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce; Women Veterans Alliance.

Will you vote for this ballot proposition?

43.3% Yes  
35.2% No  
21.5% Don't know / not sure

Ballot Proposition 32 seeks to raise the minimum wage.

**Summary of Prop 32** regarding the minimum wage increase is as follows: For employers with 26 or more employees, to \$17 immediately, \$18 on January 1, 2025. For employers with 25 or fewer employees, to \$17 on January 1, 2025, \$18 on January 1, 2026. Fiscal Impact: State and local government costs could increase or decrease by up to hundreds of millions of dollars annually. State and local revenues likely would decrease by no more than a few hundred million dollars annually. Supporters: None submitted. Opponents: California Chamber of Commerce; California Restaurant Association; California Grocers Association.

Will you vote for this ballot proposition?

43.4% Yes  
40.5% No  
16.1% Don't know / not sure

Ballot Proposition 33 expands local governments' authority to enact rent control on residential property.

**Summary of Prop 33:** Repeals Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act of 1995, which currently prohibits local ordinances limiting initial residential rental rates for new tenants or rent increases for existing tenants in certain residential properties. Fiscal Impact: Reduction in local property tax revenues of at least tens of millions of dollars annually due to likely expansion of rent control in some communities. Supporters: CA Nurses Assoc.; CA Alliance for Retired Americans; Mental Health Advocacy; Coalition for Economic Survival; Tenants Together. Opponents: California Council for Affordable Housing; Women Veterans Alliance; California Chamber of Commerce.

Will you vote for this ballot proposition?

37.1% Yes  
33.3% No  
29.6% Don't know / not sure

Ballot Proposition 36 allows felony charges and increases sentences for certain drug and theft crimes.

**Summary of Prop 36:** Allows felony charges for possessing certain drugs and for thefts under \$950, if defendant has two prior drug or theft convictions. Fiscal Impact: State criminal justice costs likely ranging from several tens of millions of dollars to the low hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Local criminal justice costs likely in the tens of millions of dollars annually. Supporters: Crime Victims United of California; California District Attorneys Association; Family Business Association of California. Opponents: Diana Becton, District Attorney Contra Costa County; Crime Survivors for Safety and Justice.

Will you vote for this ballot proposition?

57.9% Yes  
19.0% No  
23.2% Don't know / not sure

How likely do you think it is that artificial intelligence (AI) will be used to generate fake information, video, or audio in a way that it affects the election outcome in November?

60.1% Very likely  
27.4% Somewhat likely  
5.0% Somewhat unlikely  
3.9% Very unlikely  
3.5% Don't know

The unemployment rate is...

13.1% At historic highs  
25.9% Higher than last year  
31.0% Lower than last year  
13.6% At historic lows  
16.4% I don't know

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
September 12-25, 2024  
Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
University of Southern California  
Cal Poly Pomona  
MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

### Crime in California is...

27.2% At historic highs  
24.5% Higher than last year  
26.9% Lower than last year  
4.7% At historic lows  
16.7% I don't know



Questions for L.A. County residents only (N=311 likely voters living in L.A. County; MoE +/- 5.6% for the L.A. County sample):

If the election for District Attorney of Los Angeles County were held today, which candidate would you vote for?

- 44.4% Nathan Hochman
- 20.3% George Gascón
- 32.8% Don't know
- 2.6% I would skip this election

How excited are you about the Los Angeles region hosting the 2028 Summer Olympics?

- 33.3% Very excited
- 34.4% Somewhat excited
- 8.0% Somewhat not excited
- 21.2% Not very excited
- 3.2% Don't know

Los Angeles will host the Olympics in 2028. Public officials have promised a car-free Olympics in order to allow for athletes and others to travel around the region easily to Olympic events.

How feasible is a car-free Olympics in 2028?

- 9.3% Very feasible
- 22.9% Somewhat feasible
- 17.6% Somewhat unfeasible
- 46.2% Very unfeasible
- 4.0% Don't know

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
September 12-25, 2024  
Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
University of Southern California  
Cal Poly Pomona  
MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Questions for L.A. County residents only (N=311 likely voters living in L.A. County; MoE +/- 5.6% for the L.A. County sample):

A ballot proposition before Los Angeles County voters this November will change county governance. This ballot proposition increases the number of Board of Supervisor districts from 5 to 9, and creates a new elected County Executive.

Will you vote for this ballot proposition?

35.6% Yes  
17.4% No  
45.7% Don't know  
1.4% I will skip this election

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
September 12-25, 2024  
Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
University of Southern California  
Cal Poly Pomona  
MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

[Note the following two questions were randomized so respondents received only one question – asked to all statewide respondents at end of survey]

Version 1 [to ½ respondents]: Do you think Donald Trump should be replaced with a different Republican presidential nominee?

50.2% Yes  
41.6% No  
8.2% Don't know

Version 2 [to ½ respondents]: Joe Biden, who is 81 years old, stepped aside as Democratic nominee for president due to concerns over his age and capacity. Donald Trump is 78 years old, nearly the same age as Joe Biden.

Do you think Donald Trump should be replaced with a different Republican presidential nominee?

50.8% Yes  
42.2% No  
7.0% Don't know

## Crosstabs

Note: Rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Over the last year, would you say local economic conditions in your area are getting better or worse?

### Respondent gender

	Better	Worse	About same	Don't know
Man	18.8%	52.4%	26.7%	2.2%
Woman	10.9%	54.1%	32.0%	2.9%

### Respondent age

	Better	Worse	About same	Don't know
Age 18-39	11.4%	53.9%	31.4%	3.3%
Age 40-60	15.0%	56.8%	27.4%	0.9%
Age >60	19.7%	46.8%	29.4%	4.1%

### Respondent education

	Better	Worse	About same	Don't know
>= 4-year college degree	16.9%	49.8%	31.0%	2.3%
< 4-year college degree	11.1%	59.0%	26.8%	3.0%

### Respondent income

	Better	Worse	About same	Don't know
<\$50,000	8.6%	68.2%	18.8%	4.5%
\$50,000-\$100,000	9.9%	55.6%	30.7%	3.8%
>\$100,000	20.1%	48.1%	31.0%	0.9%

### Respondent race/ethnicity

	Better	Worse	About same	Don't know
Asian	11.9%	55.1%	28.9%	4.1%
Black	11.6%	45.6%	42.8%	0.1%
Latino	14.8%	57.5%	27.1%	0.6%
White	17.0%	48.2%	31.6%	3.2%

### Party identification

	Better	Worse	About same	Don't know
Democrat	25.1%	33.2%	38.2%	3.5%
Republican	1.0%	83.5%	14.1%	1.5%
Independent/ Something else	10.0%	59.7%	28.5%	1.9%

## Crosstabs

Note: Rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Over the last year, would you say California's economic conditions are getting better or worse?

### Respondent gender

	Better	Worse	About same	Don't know
Man	21.2%	58.1%	19.5%	1.2%
Woman	11.5%	62.0%	20.9%	5.5%

### Respondent age

	Better	Worse	About same	Don't know
Age 18-39	13.4%	61.9%	19.0%	5.8%
Age 40-60	16.3%	62.7%	19.8%	1.3%
Age >60	20.7%	53.3%	22.8%	3.2%

### Respondent education

	Better	Worse	About same	Don't know
>= 4-year college degree	18.4%	55.8%	22.1%	3.8%
< 4-year college degree	12.7%	67.6%	17.1%	2.6%

### Respondent income

	Better	Worse	About same	Don't know
<\$50,000	10.3%	71.6%	13.5%	4.6%
\$50,000-\$100,000	14.6%	60.4%	19.4%	5.7%
>\$100,000	19.1%	56.5%	22.5%	2.0%

### Respondent race/ethnicity

	Better	Worse	About same	Don't know
Asian	11.8%	61.9%	18.8%	7.6%
Black	15.0%	54.1%	27.2%	3.8%
Latino	15.7%	64.9%	17.2%	2.3%
White	18.6%	55.4%	22.7%	3.3%

### Party identification

	Better	Worse	About same	Don't know
Democrat	28.2%	35.6%	30.4%	5.8%
Republican	0.7%	93.8%	5.0%	0.6%
Independent/ Something else	10.5%	70.7%	17.0%	1.8%

## Crosstabs

Note: Rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Over the last year, would you say national economic conditions are getting better or worse?

### Respondent gender

	Better	Worse	About same	Don't know
Man	33.8%	52.0%	12.9%	1.3%
Woman	22.3%	56.0%	18.0%	3.7%

### Respondent age

	Better	Worse	About same	Don't know
Age 18-39	22.3%	58.1%	16.5%	3.1%
Age 40-60	26.0%	55.6%	16.3%	2.1%
Age >60	39.6%	45.5%	12.7%	2.3%

### Respondent education

	Better	Worse	About same	Don't know
>= 4-year college degree	32.2%	48.7%	16.4%	2.7%
< 4-year college degree	20.5%	63.4%	14.0%	2.1%

### Respondent income

	Better	Worse	About same	Don't know
<\$50,000	14.7%	65.9%	16.7%	2.7%
\$50,000-\$100,000	25.2%	56.5%	14.3%	4.0%
>\$100,000	33.4%	49.5%	15.6%	1.5%

### Respondent race/ethnicity

	Better	Worse	About same	Don't know
Asian	21.5%	62.0%	11.4%	5.0%
Black	29.4%	51.0%	13.8%	5.8%
Latino	23.6%	57.1%	17.0%	2.4%
White	34.4%	48.9%	14.7%	2.0%

### Party identification

	Better	Worse	About same	Don't know
Democrat	47.3%	28.5%	20.2%	4.0%
Republican	2.5%	89.0%	8.2%	0.4%
Independent/ Something else	18.5%	65.4%	14.1%	2.0%

## Crosstabs

Note: Rows do not sum to 100% due to rounding and because the option “I will skip this election” is not displayed in the crosstab tables below. Also, third party candidates vote totals are not displayed, also leading to the rows not adding up to 100.

Thinking ahead to the 2024 November general election, who do you plan to vote for president and vice president?

### Respondent gender

	Harris-Walz	Trump-Vance	Don't know
Man	54.2%	37.0%	4.4%
Woman	58.7%	30.5%	7.9%

### Respondent age

	Harris-Walz	Trump-Vance	Don't know
Age 18-39	61.5%	24.8%	8.2%
Age 40-60	50.2%	40.8%	5.9%
Age >60	58.9%	35.7%	3.5%

### Respondent education

	Harris-Walz	Trump-Vance	Don't know
>= 4-year college degree	60.0%	31.4%	3.9%
< 4-year college degree	50.8%	38.3%	9.1%

### Respondent income

	Harris-Walz	Trump-Vance	Don't know
<\$50,000	54.4%	29.1%	9.9%
\$50,000-\$100,000	60.6%	30.3%	5.5%
>\$100,000	56.6%	35.9%	4.7%

### Respondent race/ethnicity

	Harris-Walz	Trump-Vance	Don't know
Asian	58.0%	29.3%	5.5%
Black	68.7%	17.8%	10.8%
Latino	51.6%	36.6%	9.3%
White	60.7%	32.2%	3.6%

### Party identification

	Harris-Walz	Trump-Vance	Don't know
Democrat	92.0%	2.5%	3.7%
Republican	5.9%	89.6%	3.6%
Independent/Something else	42.6%	35.7%	12.5%

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
September 12-25, 2024  
Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
University of Southern California  
Cal Poly Pomona  
MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Respondent excited to vote in 2024 election

	Harris-Walz	Trump-Vance	Don't know
Very excited about election	57.6%	40.3%	3.5%
Somewhat excited about election	65.9%	29.2%	3.4%
Somewhat not excited about election	56.4%	26.4%	12.4%
Very not excited about election	44.3%	31.3%	14.9%



Crosstabs

Note: Rows do not sum to 100% due to rounding and because the option “I will skip this election” is not displayed in the crosstab tables below.

Thinking ahead to the 2024 November general election, who do you plan to vote for to be US Senator?

Respondent gender

	Schiff	Garvey	Don't know
Man	51.2%	40.5%	6.8%
Woman	54.1%	27.2%	18.3%

Respondent age

	Schiff	Garvey	Don't know
Age 18-39	56.0%	24.5%	18.3%
Age 40-60	47.7%	40.9%	10.7%
Age >60	55.6%	36.5%	7.1%

Respondent education

	Schiff	Garvey	Don't know
>= 4-year college degree	57.0%	31.7%	10.0%
< 4-year college degree	45.4%	37.8%	16.5%

Respondent income

	Schiff	Garvey	Don't know
<\$50,000	46.3%	33.6%	19.7%
\$50,000-\$100,000	57.6%	28.2%	13.5%
>\$100,000	54.3%	35.4%	9.6%

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Schiff	Garvey	Don't know
Asian	51.8%	27.3%	19.3%
Black	62.2%	18.6%	19.2%
Latino	48.9%	34.4%	15.9%
White	57.6%	33.7%	7.6%

Party identification

	Schiff	Garvey	Don't know
Democrat	87.5%	1.5%	10.0%
Republican	3.4%	86.8%	9.2%
Independent/Something else	38.8%	39.9%	19.9%

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
September 12-25, 2024  
Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
University of Southern California  
Cal Poly Pomona  
MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Respondent excited to vote in 2024 election

	Schiff	Garvey	Don't know
Very excited about election	53.5%	41.2%	4.2%
Somewhat excited about election	60.5%	28.1%	11.1%
Somewhat not excited about election	48.4%	28.0%	22.7%
Very not excited about election	45.2%	32.4%	20.5%

Crosstabs

Note: Rows do not sum to 100% due to rounding and because the option “I will skip this election” is not displayed in the crosstab tables below.

Thinking ahead to the 2024 November general election, who do you plan to vote for to be US House Representative?

Respondent gender

	Dem. candidate	GOP candidate	Don't know
Man	51.5%	38.7%	9.1%
Woman	54.5%	30.0%	15.4%

Respondent age

	Dem. candidate	GOP candidate	Don't know
Age 18-39	57.8%	27.1%	14.5%
Age 40-60	46.9%	39.5%	13.2%
Age >60	55.4%	36.7%	7.5%

Respondent education

	Dem. candidate	GOP candidate	Don't know
>= 4-year college degree	56.0%	32.2%	11.2%
< 4-year college degree	47.6%	38.1%	14.0%

Respondent income

	Dem. candidate	GOP candidate	Don't know
<\$50,000	49.4%	30.8%	19.8%
\$50,000-\$100,000	57.1%	31.1%	11.8%
>\$100,000	52.4%	35.9%	11.4%

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Dem. candidate	GOP candidate	Don't know
Asian	56.1%	28.7%	14.9%
Black	59.3%	15.6%	24.5%
Latino	50.7%	36.9%	12.4%
White	56.6%	33.1%	9.6%

Party identification

	Dem. candidate	GOP candidate	Don't know
Democrat	90.2%	2.0%	7.8%
Republican	2.8%	91.5%	5.5%
Independent/Something else	36.1%	36.8%	25.7%

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
September 12-25, 2024  
Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
University of Southern California  
Cal Poly Pomona  
MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Respondent excited to vote in 2024 election

	Dem. candidate	GOP candidate	Don't know
Very excited about election	55.4%	40.3%	4.0%
Somewhat excited about election	61.7%	29.7%	8.6%
Somewhat not excited about election	46.8%	29.8%	23.4%
Very not excited about election	43.8%	32.0%	22.4%

## Crosstabs

Note: Rows do not sum to 100% due to rounding.

How excited are you about the upcoming November election?

### Respondent gender

	Very Excited	Somewhat excited	Somewhat not excited	Not very excited	Don't Know
Man	42.0%	25.8%	10.3%	20.1%	1.7%
Woman	31.5%	29.3%	14.8%	20.3%	4.1%

### Respondent age

	Very Excited	Somewhat excited	Somewhat not excited	Not very excited	Don't Know
Age 18-39	21.7%	27.4%	17.2%	29.4%	4.4%
Age 40-60	41.6%	30.4%	10.0%	16.0%	2.0%
Age >60	51.5%	23.3%	9.8%	13.1%	2.4%

### Respondent education

	Very Excited	Somewhat excited	Somewhat not excited	Not very excited	Don't Know
>= 4 yr. college	34.8%	29.8%	12.1%	19.9%	3.3%
< 4 yr. college	41.0%	23.4%	13.1%	20.2%	2.3%

### Respondent income

	Very Excited	Somewhat excited	Somewhat not excited	Not very excited	Don't Know
<\$50,000	36.8%	25.5%	12.6%	23.6%	1.4%
\$50k-\$100k	31.9%	28.2%	16.2%	21.4%	2.3%
>\$100,000	37.6%	28.6%	11.5%	19.3%	3.0%

### Respondent race/ethnicity

	Very Excited	Somewhat excited	Somewhat not excited	Not very excited	Don't Know
Asian	28.1%	31.1%	20.3%	17.2%	3.3%
Black	44.9%	25.9%	6.3%	19.0%	3.9%
Latino	33.4%	30.0%	11.6%	21.8%	3.2%
White	38.7%	27.1%	12.7%	19.3%	2.2%

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
September 12-25, 2024  
Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
University of Southern California  
Cal Poly Pomona  
MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Party identification

	Very Excited	Somewhat excited	Somewhat not excited	Not very excited	Don't Know
Democrat	38.7%	32.3%	11.2%	16.4%	1.4%
Republican	46.4%	23.9%	9.3%	17.1%	3.4%
Ind./something else	24.6%	22.9%	18.0%	29.3%	5.3%

### Crosstabs

Note: Rows do not sum to 100% due to rounding and because the option “I will skip this election” is not displayed in the crosstab tables below.

California will elect a Governor in 2026. The following candidates have **announced they are running.**

If the election for Governor were held today, which one of the following candidates would you vote for?

#### Respondent gender

	Villaraigosa (Dem.)	Kounalakis (Dem.)	Yee (Dem.)	Atkins (Dem.)	Thurmond (Dem.)	Don't know
Man	7.1%	4.9%	5.1%	3.2%	1.1%	5.8%
Woman	8.1%	4.2%	4.1%	2.2%	4.1%	64.4%

#### Respondent age

	Villaraigosa (Dem.)	Kounalakis (Dem.)	Yee (Dem.)	Atkins (Dem.)	Thurmond (Dem.)	Don't know
Age 18-39	7.2%	3.8%	2.7%	2.2%	2.9%	70.6%
Age 40-60	7.9%	4.4%	6.2%	3.7%	2.2%	54.9%
Age >60	7.7%	5.9%	4.7%	2.0%	2.9%	58.0%

#### Respondent education

	Villaraigosa (Dem.)	Kounalakis (Dem.)	Yee (Dem.)	Atkins (Dem.)	Thurmond (Dem.)	Don't know
>= 4-year college degree	7.1%	5.5%	4.9%	2.5%	2.9%	60.6%
< 4-year college degree	8.6%	2.7%	4.1%	3.1%	1.9%	62.4%

#### Respondent income

	Villaraigosa (Dem.)	Kounalakis (Dem.)	Yee (Dem.)	Atkins (Dem.)	Thurmond (Dem.)	Don't know
<\$50,000	10.1%	2.0%	2.5%	1.1%	2.6%	68.1%
\$50,000-\$100,000	8.7%	3.9%	7.8%	3.5%	2.1%	60.1%
>\$100,000	6.9%	5.5%	3.8%	3.2%	3.4%	59.7%

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
 September 12-25, 2024  
 Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
 N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
 University of Southern California  
 Cal Poly Pomona  
 MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Villaraigosa (Dem.)	Kounalakis (Dem.)	Yee (Dem.)	Atkins (Dem.)	Thurmond (Dem.)	Don't know
Asian	2.9%	1.4%	11.9%	4.1%	2.6%	67.3%
Black	13.7%	4.0%	3.9%	6.6%	5.9%	52.1%
Latino	12.9%	4.1%	4.0%	3.2%	3.1%	57.6%
White	5.2%	6.3%	3.8%	2.0%	2.5%	63.5%

Party identification

	Villaraigosa (Dem.)	Kounalakis (Dem.)	Yee (Dem.)	Atkins (Dem.)	Thurmond (Dem.)	Don't know
Democrat	10.6%	7.5%	6.4%	4.2%	3.9%	65.3%
Republican	3.2%	1.1%	1.4%	0.9%	0.5%	51.8%
Indep./Something else	6.5%	2.6%	4.3%	1.9%	2.3%	63.5%



Crosstabs

Note: Rows do not sum to 100% due to rounding and because the option “I will skip this election” is not displayed in the crosstab tables below.

California will elect a Governor in 2026. The list of candidates below **includes people who are rumored to be considering a run for Governor and people who have announced they are running** for Governor.

If the election for Governor were held today, which one of the following candidates would you vote for?

Respondent gender

	Porter (Dem.)	Dahle (Rep.)	Bonta (Dem.)	Hilton (Rep.)	Bianco (Rep.)	Becerra (Dem.)	Caruso (Dem.)
Man	14.3%	6.0%	3.8%	4.2%	6.5%	2.4%	3.6%
Woman	13.7%	4.6%	3.2%	3.9%	2.9%	3.4%	1.7%

	Villaraigosa (Dem.)	Yee (Dem.)	Kounalakis (Dem.)	Chen (Rep.)	Atkins (Dem.)	Thurmond (Dem.)	Don't know
Man	2.3%	2.4%	2.0%	2.6%	1.6%	0.4%	45.3%
Woman	2.8%	2.7%	2.2%	0.8%	1.0%	2.2%	53.5%

Respondent age

	Porter (Dem.)	Dahle (Rep.)	Bonta (Dem.)	Hilton (Rep.)	Bianco (Rep.)	Becerra (Dem.)	Caruso (Dem.)
Age 18-39	13.9%	3.5%	4.4%	1.3%	4.0%	1.9%	1.9%
Age 40-60	13.1%	6.8%	3.5%	4.7%	6.1%	3.2%	2.8%
Age >60	15.6%	5.7%	2.2%	7.1%	3.6%	3.9%	3.4%

	Villaraigosa (Dem.)	Yee (Dem.)	Kounalakis (Dem.)	Chen (Rep.)	Atkins (Dem.)	Thurmond (Dem.)	Don't know
Age 18-39	1.3%	1.7%	1.4%	0.5%	0.7%	1.5%	60.4%
Age 40-60	3.6%	3.6%	1.9%	2.8%	2.2%	1.1%	42.3%
Age >60	2.8%	2.2%	3.5%	1.8%	0.9%	1.3%	44.3%

Respondent education

	Porter (Dem.)	Dahle (Rep.)	Bonta (Dem.)	Hilton (Rep.)	Bianco (Rep.)	Becerra (Dem.)	Caruso (Dem.)
>=4 yr. college	15.8%	4.5%	4.1%	4.1%	4.7%	3.3%	3.2%
< 4-yr. college	10.6%	7.0%	2.4%	4.0%	4.7%	2.2%	1.6%

	Villaraigosa (Dem.)	Yee (Dem.)	Kounalakis (Dem.)	Chen (Rep.)	Atkins (Dem.)	Thurmond (Dem.)	Don't know
>=4 yr. college	2.4%	2.8%	2.3%	2.0%	1.4%	1.5%	46.0%
< 4-yr. college	2.9%	2.2%	1.7%	1.3%	1.3%	0.9%	55.2%

Respondent income

	Porter (Dem.)	Dahle (Rep.)	Bonta (Dem.)	Hilton (Rep.)	Bianco (Rep.)	Becerra (Dem.)	Caruso (Dem.)
<\$50,000	11.9%	8.4%	1.3%	9.6%	2.6%	3.2%	1.2%
\$50,000-\$100,000	12.8%	4.7%	5.1%	2.0%	3.7%	2.3%	1.9%
>\$100,000	16.2%	5.0%	2.6%	3.4%	6.3%	3.4%	3.6%

	Villaraigosa (Dem.)	Yee (Dem.)	Kounalakis (Dem.)	Chen (Rep.)	Atkins (Dem.)	Thurmond (Dem.)	Don't know
<\$50,000	1.5%	1.5%	1.6%	0.1%	0.9%	1.0%	52.6%
\$50,000-\$100,000	3.0%	5.2%	1.2%	2.7%	1.6%	1.2%	50.9%
>\$100,000	2.4%	1.8%	2.9%	1.6%	1.6%	1.7%	45.7%

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Porter (Dem.)	Dahle (Rep.)	Bonta (Dem.)	Hilton (Rep.)	Bianco (Rep.)	Becerra (Dem.)	Caruso (Dem.)
Asian	9.9%	4.2%	5.8%	2.0%	3.3%	0.4%	1.8%
Black	12.4%	2.1%	7.1%	0.1%	4.9%	5.5%	4.7%
Latino	13.4%	5.8%	4.6%	2.7%	7.8%	5.2%	1.1%
White	17.0%	5.3%	2.6%	5.3%	3.4%	1.8%	2.6%

	Villaraigosa (Dem.)	Yee (Dem.)	Kounalakis (Dem.)	Chen (Rep.)	Atkins (Dem.)	Thurmond (Dem.)	Don't know
Asian	1.3%	9.1%	0.3%	1.7%	0.1%	0.3%	58.0%
Black	5.0%	5.8%	3.9%	2.8%	4.6%	2.5%	36.0%
Latino	4.4%	3.2%	1.4%	0.4%	2.2%	1.7%	44.4%
White	1.8%	1.9%	3.0%	1.7%	0.9%	1.2%	49.9%

Party identification

	Porter (Dem.)	Dahle (Rep.)	Bonta (Dem.)	Hilton (Rep.)	Bianco (Rep.)	Becerra (Dem.)	Caruso (Dem.)
Dem.	22.8%	0.1%	5.6%	0.6%	0.2%	5.4%	2.1%
Rep.	0.2%	15.3%	1.0%	12.0%	15.2%	0.1%	2.5%
Ind./else	11.6%	5.3%	2.3%	2.7%	2.9%	1.3%	3.7%

	Villaraigosa (Dem.)	Yee (Dem.)	Kounalakis (Dem.)	Chen (Rep.)	Atkins (Dem.)	Thurmond (Dem.)	Don't know
Dem.	2.9%	3.8%	3.4%	0.2%	2.7%	2.2%	47.6%
Rep.	0.4%	0.8%	0.5%	3.0%	0.2%	0.5%	46.0%
Ind./else	3.9%	2.0%	1.4%	3.0%	0.1%	0.6%	55.6%

Crosstabs

Note: Rows do not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Governor Gavin Newsom is term limited and cannot run again in 2026. If Newsom were allowed to run, would you vote for him for Governor?

Respondent gender

	Would definitely vote for Newsom	Might vote for Newsom	Might not vote for Newsom	Would definitely not vote for Newsom
Man	19.0%	26.0%	8.3%	46.7%
Woman	21.3%	27.6%	8.4%	38.0%

Respondent age

	Would definitely vote for Newsom	Might vote for Newsom	Might not vote for Newsom	Would definitely not vote for Newsom
Age 18-39	15.6%	34.9%	14.7%	34.8%
Age 40-60	21.3%	20.1%	10.2%	48.4%
Age >60	25.1%	25.5%	5.6%	43.8%

Respondent education

	Would definitely vote for Newsom	Might vote for Newsom	Might not vote for Newsom	Would definitely not vote for Newsom
>= 4-year college degree	20.6%	28.3%	10.9%	40.2%
< 4-year college degree	19.0%	24.6%	9.8%	46.6%

Respondent income

	Would definitely vote for Newsom	Might vote for Newsom	Might not vote for Newsom	Would definitely not vote for Newsom
<\$50,000	20.9%	26.1%	13.0%	40.0%
\$50,000-\$100,000	18.6%	32.6%	13.6%	35.2%
>\$100,000	44.3%	25.1%	9.4%	44.3%

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Would definitely vote for Newsom	Might vote for Newsom	Might not vote for Newsom	Would definitely not vote for Newsom
Asian	14.0%	40.1%	14.1%	31.9%
Black	31.8%	18.4%	13.1%	36.7%
Latino	20.9%	24.7%	9.8%	44.6%
White	20.4%	27.5%	11.9%	40.2%

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
September 12-25, 2024  
Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
University of Southern California  
Cal Poly Pomona  
MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Party identification

	Would definitely vote for Newsom	Might vote for Newsom	Might not vote for Newsom	Would definitely not vote for Newsom
Democrat	36.0%	43.8%	13.1%	7.1%
Republican	0.4%	3.4%	2.6%	93.6%
Independent/ Something else	11.2%	19.5%	14.3%	54.9%

Crosstabs

Note: Rows do not sum to 100% due to rounding and because the option “I will skip this election” is not displayed in the crosstab tables below.

California will elect a Lieutenant Governor in 2026. Only two candidates have announced so far. If the election for Lieutenant Governor were held today, which one of the following candidates would you vote for?

Respondent gender

	Stephen Bradford (D)	Fiona Ma (D)	Don't know
Man	4.6%	12.2%	64.0%
Woman	3.5%	18.0%	66.7%

Respondent age

	Stephen Bradford (D)	Fiona Ma (D)	Don't know
Age 18-39	4.7%	16.1%	68.1%
Age 40-60	5.7%	14.5%	56.7%
Age >60	4.4%	13.9%	62.6%

Respondent education

	Stephen Bradford (D)	Fiona Ma (D)	Don't know
>= 4-year college degree	4.6%	17.2%	60.0%
< 4-year college degree	5.9%	10.9%	66.0%

Respondent income

	Stephen Bradford (D)	Fiona Ma (D)	Don't know
<\$50,000	7.3%	15.0%	66.9%
\$50,000-\$100,000	5.8%	19.5%	60.4%
>\$100,000	4.3%	14.4%	61.7%

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Stephen Bradford (D)	Fiona Ma (D)	Don't know
Asian	5.2%	19.9%	63.4%
Black	11.1%	24.2%	52.1%
Latino	5.3%	16.9%	59.8%
White	4.3%	15.0%	64.5%

Party identification

	Stephen Bradford (D)	Fiona Ma (D)	Don't know
Democrat	7.9%	25.6%	64.5%
Republican	1.8%	2.7%	49.1%
Independent/Something else	2.9%	8.0%	71.0%

Crosstabs

Note: Rows do not sum to 100% due to rounding.

There is a bill to regulate artificial intelligence (AI) in California's state legislature. This bill would require some large AI models—above a set cost and size threshold—to adopt safety steps. Supporters of the bill say this will protect people from AI in the future by creating a killswitch and other protections, while opponents say the bill will hurt innovation and cause tech and AI jobs to move out of state.

Do you support or oppose this bill?

Respondent gender

	Support	Oppose	Don't know
Man	56.4%	18.3%	25.3%
Woman	57.4%	11.1%	31.4%

Respondent age

	Support	Oppose	Don't know
Age 18-39	59.8%	15.2%	25.1%
Age 40-60	54.8%	15.3%	29.9%
Age >60	55.9%	12.9%	31.2%

Respondent education

	Support	Oppose	Don't know
>= 4-year college degree	57.4%	15.2%	27.5%
< 4-year college degree	56.7%	13.3%	30.0%

Respondent income

	Support	Oppose	Don't know
<\$50,000	66.5%	12.5%	21.1%
\$50,000-\$100,000	60.9%	12.0%	27.1%
>\$100,000	54.5%	16.6%	28.9%

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Support	Oppose	Don't know
Asian	59.7%	15.8%	24.5%
Black	70.0%	16.7%	13.4%
Latino	57.5%	14.7%	27.8%
White	57.1%	13.3%	29.7%

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
September 12-25, 2024  
Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
University of Southern California  
Cal Poly Pomona  
MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Party identification

	Support	Oppose	Don't know
Democrat	69.7%	8.1%	22.2%
Republican	41.4%	24.5%	34.1%
Independent/Something else	49.4%	16.8%	33.8%



Crosstabs

Note: Rows do not sum to 100% due to rounding.

California Governor Gavin Newsom recently issued an executive order directing state agencies to move urgently to remove dangerous homeless encampments while supporting and assisting the individuals living in them. The executive order also provided guidance for cities and counties to immediately begin removing homeless encampments following a court decision making it easier to do so in California.

Do you approve or disapprove of this executive order?

Respondent gender

	Approve	Disapprove	Don't know
Man	74.8%	14.6%	10.6%
Woman	69.3%	15.6%	15.1%

Respondent age

	Approve	Disapprove	Don't know
Age 18-39	66.9%	20.1%	12.9%
Age 40-60	74.8%	11.8%	13.4%
Age >60	75.1%	13.0%	11.9%

Respondent education

	Approve	Disapprove	Don't know
>= 4-year college degree	73.0%	15.1%	11.9%
< 4-year college degree	70.9%	15.5%	13.6%

Respondent income

	Approve	Disapprove	Don't know
<\$50,000	65.3%	18.4%	16.2%
\$50,000-\$100,000	69.9%	18.1%	11.9%
>\$100,000	76.2%	12.4%	11.4%

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Approve	Disapprove	Don't know
Asian	68.2%	19.9%	12.0%
Black	79.5%	12.5%	8.0%
Latino	72.8%	14.0%	12.4%
White	69.8%	16.7%	13.1%

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
 September 12-25, 2024  
 Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
 N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
 University of Southern California  
 Cal Poly Pomona  
 MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Party identification

	Approve	Disapprove	Don't know
Democrat	70.3%	16.6%	13.1%
Republican	79.7%	10.9%	9.4%
Independent/Something else	67.9%	16.5%	15.6%

Respondent is renter or owner

	Approve	Disapprove	Don't know
Owner	75.4%	11.9%	12.8%
Renter	69.0%	18.8%	12.2%

Crosstabs

Note: Rows do not sum to 100% due to rounding.

A policy proposal would allow undocumented immigrants in California to be eligible for up to \$150,000 in state-supported home loans for first-time home buyers.

Do you support or oppose this policy proposal?

Respondent gender

	Support	Oppose	Don't know
Man	16.0%	70.4%	13.6%
Woman	22.1%	61.0%	16.9%

Respondent age

	Support	Oppose	Don't know
Age 18-39	29.5%	52.5%	18.0%
Age 40-60	13.0%	73.5%	13.6%
Age >60	13.1%	73.1%	13.8%

Respondent education

	Support	Oppose	Don't know
>= 4-year college degree	18.6%	64.9%	16.6%
< 4-year college degree	20.4%	67.3%	12.3%

Respondent income

	Support	Oppose	Don't know
<\$50,000	31.2%	50.6%	18.3%
\$50,000-\$100,000	22.8%	65.6%	11.7%
>\$100,000	14.8%	69.0%	16.2%

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Support	Oppose	Don't know
Asian	17.5%	71.2%	11.3%
Black	16.0%	73.1%	10.9%
Latino	21.3%	60.5%	18.2%
White	19.1%	63.6%	17.3%

Party identification

	Support	Oppose	Don't know
Democrat	30.8%	44.5%	24.7%
Republican	8.6%	96.5%	2.7%
Independent/Something else	15.9%	73.5%	10.7%

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
September 12-25, 2024  
Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
University of Southern California  
Cal Poly Pomona  
MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Respondent is renter or owner

	Support	Oppose	Don't know
Owner	14.0%	72.1%	14.0%
Renter	28.2%	57.7%	14.1%

Crosstabs

Note: Rows do not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Should there be age limits to serve as president?

Respondent gender

	Yes	No	Don't know
Man	65.3%	30.0%	4.8%
Woman	71.4%	17.1%	11.5%

Respondent age

	Yes	No	Don't know
Age 18-39	74.2%	16.7%	9.1%
Age 40-60	66.8%	26.3%	6.9%
Age >60	62.3%	28.9%	8.8%

Respondent education

	Yes	No	Don't know
>= 4-year college degree	67.7%	26.3%	6.1%
< 4-year college degree	70.6%	17.9%	11.5%

Respondent income

	Yes	No	Don't know
<\$50,000	67.4%	22.0%	10.7%
\$50,000-\$100,000	72.4%	20.6%	7.0%
>\$100,000	67.5%	24.3%	8.2%

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Yes	No	Don't know
Asian	70.2%	22.6%	7.2%
Black	70.9%	26.1%	2.9%
Latino	73.8%	18.3%	7.9%
White	66.4%	24.4%	9.2%

Party identification

	Yes	No	Don't know
Democrat	77.9%	15.7%	6.4%
Republican	54.6%	38.1%	7.3%
Independent/Something else	64.8%	23.1%	12.1%

Crosstabs

Note: Rows do not sum to 100% due to rounding.

A bill proposed in the California legislature would create a public agency to develop housing directly paid for by taxpayers, which would lead to an increase in construction of new public housing and social housing.

Do you support or oppose this policy proposal?

Respondent gender

	Support	Oppose	Don't know
Man	38.9%	45.2%	15.9%
Woman	36.1%	35.8%	28.1%

Respondent age

	Support	Oppose	Don't know
Age 18-39	48.3%	27.6%	24.1%
Age 40-60	30.9%	47.6%	21.5%
Age >60	31.7%	48.3%	20.1%

Respondent education

	Support	Oppose	Don't know
>= 4-year college degree	38.4%	37.9%	23.7%
< 4-year college degree	36.0%	45.3%	18.8%

Respondent income

	Support	Oppose	Don't know
<\$50,000	53.6%	28.6%	17.8%
\$50,000-\$100,000	40.8%	34.4%	24.9%
>\$100,000	33.9%	44.3%	21.8%

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Support	Oppose	Don't know
Asian	27.8%	48.1%	24.1%
Black	47.4%	30.2%	22.5%
Latino	35.2%	40.8%	24.0%
White	37.5%	39.9%	22.7%

Party identification

	Support	Oppose	Don't know
Democrat	57.9%	15.0%	27.0%
Republican	7.3%	80.6%	12.1%
Independent/Something else	30.1%	47.0%	22.9%

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
September 12-25, 2024  
Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
University of Southern California  
Cal Poly Pomona  
MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Respondent is renter or owner

	Support	Oppose	Don't know
Owner	31.2%	47.5%	21.3%
Renter	45.4%	31.6%	23.0%

Crosstabs

Note: Rows do not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Housing First policies seek to place individuals experiencing homelessness in temporary or permanent housing to get them off the streets and connect them to support services. How effective do you think these policies are in reducing the number of people experiencing homelessness?

Respondent gender

	Very effective	Somewhat effective	Somewhat not effective	Very ineffective	Don't know
Man	9.7%	35.8%	14.4%	30.8%	9.5%
Woman	12.5%	36.2%	22.3%	18.9%	10.0%

Respondent age

	Very effective	Somewhat effective	Somewhat not effective	Very ineffective	Don't know
Age 18-39	15.1%	37.3%	18.9%	19.0%	9.8%
Age 40-60	9.9%	31.8%	19.5%	28.0%	10.8%
Age >60	7.1%	40.6%	15.9%	28.4%	7.9%

Respondent education

	Very effective	Somewhat effective	Somewhat not effective	Very ineffective	Don't know
>= 4 yr. college	11.1%	36.3%	18.2%	23.7%	10.7%
< 4 yr. college	10.6%	35.7%	18.9%	26.9%	7.9%

Respondent income

	Very effective	Somewhat effective	Somewhat not effective	Very ineffective	Don't Know
<\$50,000	19.2%	40.9%	12.9%	18.3%	8.7%
\$50k-\$100k	13.0%	36.4%	23.1%	19.6%	7.9%
>\$100,000	7.4%	35.9%	18.4%	28.5%	9.8%

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Very effective	Somewhat effective	Somewhat not effective	Very ineffective	Don't know
Asian	11.0%	36.6%	17.0%	24.1%	11.3%
Black	19.4%	19.5%	37.3%	13.8%	10.0%
Latino	8.8%	36.8%	22.5%	23.6%	8.4%
White	11.4%	37.6%	17.9%	24.0%	9.1%



California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
 September 12-25, 2024  
 Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
 N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
 University of Southern California  
 Cal Poly Pomona  
 MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Party identification

	Very effective	Somewhat effective	Somewhat not effective	Very ineffective	Don't know
Democrat	16.6%	50.0%	16.7%	7.4%	9.3%
Republican	2.5%	18.6%	21.0%	50.7%	7.2%
Ind./something else	9.7%	28.0%	18.9%	30.6%	12.7%

Respondent is renter or owner

	Very effective	Somewhat effective	Somewhat not effective	Very ineffective	Don't know
Owner	8.8%	32.9%	19.2%	28.2%	10.9%
Renter	13.6%	39.6%	18.8%	20.1%	8.0%

Crosstabs

Note: Rows do not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Do you favor programs that offer ‘people experiencing homelessness’ services without any conditions such as therapy or counseling for substance abuse?

Respondent gender

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat not favor	Strongly not favor	Don't Know
Man	18.6%	22.5%	17.5%	35.4%	6.0%
Woman	21.7%	19.0%	17.7%	32.2%	9.4%

Respondent age

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat not favor	Strongly not favor	Don't Know
Age 18-39	23.7%	20.0%	17.8%	26.6%	11.9%
Age 40-60	19.7%	18.8%	18.5%	37.7%	5.4%
Age >60	15.6%	24.9%	16.0%	38.4%	5.1%

Respondent education

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat not favor	Strongly not favor	Don't Know
>= 4 yr. college	19.7%	19.9%	19.8%	33.4%	7.2%
< 4 yr. college	20.7%	22.8%	13.3%	34.5%	8.7%

Respondent income

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat not favor	Strongly not favor	Don't Know
<\$50,000	22.8%	29.5%	16.6%	23.9%	7.2%
\$50k-\$100k	21.8%	23.5%	19.1%	26.6%	9.1%
>\$100,000	18.1%	17.7%	17.5%	40.1%	6.6%

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat not favor	Strongly not favor	Don't Know
Asian	21.8%	21.6%	22.5%	28.0%	6.1%
Black	27.3%	14.9%	12.1%	36.1%	9.6%
Latino	18.6%	19.1%	19.3%	35.5%	7.5%
White	20.1%	23.8%	15.9%	30.9%	9.3%

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
 September 12-25, 2024  
 Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
 N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
 University of Southern California  
 Cal Poly Pomona  
 MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Party identification

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat not favor	Strongly not favor	Don't know
Democrat	25.3%	25.4%	20.0%	21.1%	8.1%
Republican	6.5%	16.4%	15.6%	55.4%	6.1%
Indep./something else	23.7%	16.7%	15.4%	35.7%	8.5%

Respondent is renter or owner

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat not favor	Strongly not favor	Don't know
Owner	17.7%	20.7%	16.2%	37.5%	7.9%
Renter	23.6%	22.4%	17.7%	29.4%	7.0%

Crosstabs

Note: Rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Ballot proposition 2 authorizes bonds for public school and community college facilities.

**Summary of Prop 2:** Authorizes \$10 billion in general obligation bonds for repair, upgrade, and construction of facilities at K–12 public schools (including charter schools), community colleges, and career technical education programs, including for improvement of health and safety conditions and classroom upgrades. Requires annual audits. Fiscal Impact: Increased state costs of about \$500 million annually for 35 years to repay the bond. Supporters: California Teachers Association; California School Nurses Organization; Community College League of California. Opponents: Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association.

Respondent gender

	Yes	No	Don't know
Man	50.6%	37.0%	12.4%
Woman	56.3%	21.4%	22.3%

Respondent age

	Yes	No	Don't know
Age 18-39	61.5%	17.4%	21.1%
Age 40-60	48.1%	35.1%	16.8%
Age >60	51.9%	34.7%	13.4%

Respondent education

	Yes	No	Don't know
>= 4-year college degree	55.1%	28.1%	16.8%
< 4-year college degree	52.4%	29.2%	18.4%

Respondent income

	Yes	No	Don't know
<\$50,000	63.8%	17.1%	19.2%
\$50,000-\$100,000	54.9%	23.7%	21.4%
>\$100,000	52.5%	31.7%	15.8%

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
September 12-25, 2024  
Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
University of Southern California  
Cal Poly Pomona  
MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Yes	No	Don't know
Asian	59.6%	20.5%	19.9%
Black	66.0%	23.6%	10.4%
Latino	55.1%	25.6%	19.3%
White	55.6%	28.6%	15.8%

Party identification

	Yes	No	Don't know
Democrat	75.9%	7.4%	16.8%
Republican	22.6%	59.1%	18.3%
Independent/Something else	45.3%	36.6%	18.1%

Crosstabs

Note: Rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Ballot proposition 3 creates a state constitutional right to marriage.

**Summary of Prop 3:** Amends California Constitution to recognize fundamental right to marry, regardless of sex or race. Removes language in California Constitution stating that marriage is only between a man and a woman. Fiscal Impact: No change in revenues or costs for state and local governments. Supporters: Sierra Pacific Synod of The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; Dolores Huerta Foundation; Equality California. Opponents: Jonathan Keller, California Family Council; Rev. Tanner DiBella.

Will you vote for this ballot proposition?

Respondent gender

	Yes	No	Don't know
Man	63.8%	27.4%	8.8%
Woman	67.6%	20.8%	11.6%

Respondent age

	Yes	No	Don't know
Age 18-39	72.3%	17.8%	9.9%
Age 40-60	59.9%	28.1%	12.0%
Age >60	65.0%	27.0%	8.0%

Respondent education

	Yes	No	Don't know
>= 4-year college degree	69.6%	22.3%	8.1%
< 4-year college degree	59.5%	27.4%	13.2%

Respondent income

	Yes	No	Don't know
<\$50,000	65.5%	21.9%	12.6%
\$50,000-\$100,000	65.5%	22.7%	11.8%
>\$100,000	68.2%	23.6%	8.2%

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Yes	No	Don't know
Asian	69.3%	20.1%	10.7%
Black	67.7%	18.7%	13.6%
Latino	59.3%	30.7%	10.1%
White	72.6%	18.5%	8.9%

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
September 12-25, 2024  
Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
University of Southern California  
Cal Poly Pomona  
MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Party identification

	Yes	No	Don't know
Democrat	87.5%	5.2%	7.4%
Republican	28.0%	58.6%	13.4%
Independent/Something else	63.0%	24.7%	12.3%

Crosstabs

Note: Rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

**Summary of Prop 4:** Authorizes \$10 billion in general obligation bonds for water, wildfire prevention, and protection of communities and lands. Requires annual audits. Fiscal Impact: Increased state costs of about \$400 million annually for 40 years to repay the bond. Supporters: Clean Water Action; CALFIRE Firefighters; National Wildlife Federation; The Nature Conservancy. Opponents: Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association.

Will you vote for this ballot proposition?

Respondent gender

	Yes	No	Don't know
Man	56.9%	30.5%	12.6%
Woman	63.8%	18.0%	18.2%

Respondent age

	Yes	No	Don't know
Age 18-39	65.2%	16.2%	18.6%
Age 40-60	57.1%	28.6%	14.3%
Age >60	58.4%	29.0%	12.6%

Respondent education

	Yes	No	Don't know
>= 4-year college degree	61.4%	23.1%	15.5%
< 4-year college degree	59.2%	25.9%	14.9%

Respondent income

	Yes	No	Don't know
<\$50,000	69.5%	15.5%	15.0%
\$50,000-\$100,000	63.2%	19.8%	17.0%
>\$100,000	58.0%	27.1%	14.9%

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Yes	No	Don't know
Asian	60.7%	19.4%	19.9%
Black	61.8%	20.8%	17.3%
Latino	61.6%	24.9%	13.5%
White	62.5%	23.2%	14.3%



California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
September 12-25, 2024  
Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
University of Southern California  
Cal Poly Pomona  
MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Party identification

	Yes	No	Don't know
Democrat	81.6%	5.4%	13.0%
Republican	31.4%	53.5%	15.1%
Independent/Something else	50.9%	29.0%	20.1%

Crosstabs

Note: Rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Ballot proposition 5 allows local bonds for affordable housing and public infrastructure with 55% voter approval.

**Summary of Prop 5:** Allows approval of local infrastructure and housing bonds for low- and middle-income Californians with 55% vote. Fiscal Impact: Increased local borrowing to fund affordable housing, supportive housing, and public infrastructure. The amount would depend on decisions by local governments and voters. Borrowing would be repaid with higher property taxes. Supporters: California Professional Firefighters; League of Women Voters of California; Habitat for Humanity California. Opponents: California Taxpayers Association; California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce; Women Veterans Alliance.

Will you vote for this ballot proposition?

Respondent gender

	Yes	No	Don't know
Man	39.6%	41.7%	18.7%
Woman	46.9%	29.0%	24.2%

Respondent age

	Yes	No	Don't know
Age 18-39	52.3%	22.5%	25.1%
Age 40-60	36.4%	42.5%	21.1%
Age >60	40.6%	42.8%	16.6%

Respondent education

	Yes	No	Don't know
>= 4-year college degree	43.7%	33.2%	23.1%
< 4-year college degree	43.0%	39.1%	17.9%

Respondent income

	Yes	No	Don't know
<\$50,000	59.2%	23.5%	17.4%
\$50,000-\$100,000	51.1%	29.7%	19.2%
>\$100,000	36.7%	40.1%	23.3%

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
 September 12-25, 2024  
 Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
 N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
 University of Southern California  
 Cal Poly Pomona  
 MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Yes	No	Don't know
Asian	55.6%	21.5%	23.0%
Black	57.4%	30.5%	12.1%
Latino	42.6%	34.6%	22.8%
White	41.5%	35.3%	23.2%

Party identification

	Yes	No	Don't know
Democrat	63.9%	11.9%	24.3%
Republican	13.9%	69.3%	16.8%
Independent/Something else	35.2%	43.8%	21.0%

Respondent is renter or owner

	Yes	No	Don't know
Owner	35.5%	43.3%	21.1%
Renter	54.3%	25.2%	20.5%

Crosstabs

Note: Rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Ballot Proposition 32 seeks to raise the minimum wage.

**Summary of Prop 32** regarding the minimum wage increase is as follows:  
 For employers with 26 or more employees, to \$17 immediately, \$18 on January 1, 2025. For employers with 25 or fewer employees, to \$17 on January 1, 2025, \$18 on January 1, 2026. Fiscal Impact: State and local government costs could increase or decrease by up to hundreds of millions of dollars annually. State and local revenues likely would decrease by no more than a few hundred million dollars annually. Supporters: None submitted. Opponents: California Chamber of Commerce; California Restaurant Association; California Grocers Association.

Will you vote for this ballot proposition?

Respondent gender

	Yes	No	Don't know
Man	40.8%	47.1%	12.1%
Woman	45.9%	34.1%	20.0%

Respondent age

	Yes	No	Don't know
Age 18-39	52.7%	29.8%	17.5%
Age 40-60	37.3%	48.0%	14.7%
Age >60	39.1%	44.6%	16.3%

Respondent education

	Yes	No	Don't know
>= 4-year college degree	42.2%	41.0%	16.8%
< 4-year college degree	46.0%	39.7%	14.4%

Respondent income

	Yes	No	Don't know
<\$50,000	57.2%	27.3%	15.5%
\$50,000-\$100,000	47.7%	35.8%	16.5%
>\$100,000	38.9%	45.1%	16.0%

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
 September 12-25, 2024  
 Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
 N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
 University of Southern California  
 Cal Poly Pomona  
 MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Yes	No	Don't know
Asian	53.0%	29.2%	17.8%
Black	55.1%	26.3%	18.6%
Latino	41.7%	41.7%	16.6%
White	44.4%	39.2%	16.4%

Party identification

	Yes	No	Don't know
Democrat	66.3%	15.5%	18.2%
Republican	10.3%	78.9%	10.9%
Independent/Something else	34.7%	48.0%	17.4%

Crosstabs

Note: Rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Ballot Proposition 33 expands local governments' authority to enact rent control on residential property.

**Summary of Prop 33:** Repeals Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act of 1995, which currently prohibits local ordinances limiting initial residential rental rates for new tenants or rent increases for existing tenants in certain residential properties. Fiscal Impact: Reduction in local property tax revenues of at least tens of millions of dollars annually due to likely expansion of rent control in some communities. Supporters: CA Nurses Assoc.; CA Alliance for Retired Americans; Mental Health Advocacy; Coalition for Economic Survival; Tenants Together. Opponents: California Council for Affordable Housing; Women Veterans Alliance; California Chamber of Commerce.

Will you vote for this ballot proposition?

Respondent gender

	Yes	No	Don't know
Man	34.9%	43.5%	21.7%
Woman	39.2%	23.6%	37.2%

Respondent age

	Yes	No	Don't know
Age 18-39	43.0%	23.5%	33.4%
Age 40-60	35.1%	36.9%	28.0%
Age >60	31.3%	42.4%	26.3%

Respondent education

	Yes	No	Don't know
>= 4-year college degree	36.5%	34.7%	28.9%
< 4-year college degree	38.9%	30.4%	30.6%

Respondent income

	Yes	No	Don't know
<\$50,000	52.8%	22.8%	24.4%
\$50,000-\$100,000	42.0%	21.3%	36.7%
>\$100,000	29.9%	43.2%	26.9%

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
 September 12-25, 2024  
 Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
 N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
 University of Southern California  
 Cal Poly Pomona  
 MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Yes	No	Don't know
Asian	39.5%	37.1%	23.4%
Black	48.1%	30.1%	21.8%
Latino	42.2%	26.8%	30.9%
White	35.8%	34.0%	30.2%

Party identification

	Yes	No	Don't know
Democrat	48.6%	18.0%	33.4%
Republican	21.6%	54.0%	24.5%
Independent/Something else	31.7%	40.6%	27.8%

Respondent is renter or owner

	Yes	No	Don't know
Owner	29.2%	41.6%	29.2%
Renter	49.4%	22.5%	28.1%

Crosstabs

Note: Rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Ballot Proposition 36 allows felony charges and increases sentences for certain drug and theft crimes.

**Summary of Prop 36:** Allows felony charges for possessing certain drugs and for thefts under \$950, if defendant has two prior drug or theft convictions. Fiscal Impact: State criminal justice costs likely ranging from several tens of millions of dollars to the low hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Local criminal justice costs likely in the tens of millions of dollars annually. Supporters: Crime Victims United of California; California District Attorneys Association; Family Business Association of California. Opponents: Diana Becton, District Attorney Contra Costa County; Crime Survivors for Safety and Justice.

Will you vote for this ballot proposition?

Respondent gender

	Yes	No	Don't know
Man	65.2%	19.1%	15.7%
Woman	50.8%	18.9%	30.4%

Respondent age

	Yes	No	Don't know
Age 18-39	49.9%	20.5%	30.0%
Age 40-60	61.9%	18.5%	19.6%
Age >60	63.6%	17.4%	19.1%

Respondent education

	Yes	No	Don't know
>= 4-year college degree	56.5%	20.8%	22.7%
< 4-year college degree	60.6%	15.8%	23.7%

Respondent income

	Yes	No	Don't know
<\$50,000	50.6%	23.6%	25.8%
\$50,000-\$100,000	51.4%	19.0%	29.6%
>\$100,000	63.8%	17.2%	19.1%



California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
 September 12-25, 2024  
 Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
 N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
 University of Southern California  
 Cal Poly Pomona  
 MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Yes	No	Don't know
Asian	62.1%	16.7%	21.2%
Black	53.2%	25.2%	21.6%
Latino	59.2%	15.0%	25.9%
White	55.4%	21.7%	22.9%

Party identification

	Yes	No	Don't know
Democrat	43.9%	23.6%	32.5%
Republican	81.8%	7.0%	11.2%
Independent/Something else	59.8%	21.9%	18.3%

Perceptions of crime: Crime in California is...

	Yes	No	Don't know
At historic highs	82.7%	8.9%	8.3%
Higher than last year	69.2%	9.7%	21.1%
Lower than last year	42.1%	29.5%	28.4%
At historic lows	20.7%	51.1%	28.3%

Crosstabs

Note: Rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

How likely do you think it is that artificial intelligence (AI) will be used to generate fake information, video, or audio in a way that it affects the election outcome in November?

Respondent gender

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely	Don't Know
Man	58.9%	27.6%	5.9%	5.0%	2.6%
Woman	61.3%	27.2%	4.2%	3.0%	4.3%

Respondent age

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely	Don't Know
Age 18-39	58.5%	29.8%	4.6%	3.2%	3.9%
Age 40-60	59.9%	26.6%	5.0%	5.3%	3.2%
Age >60	62.8%	25.0%	5.8%	3.2%	3.3%

Respondent education

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely	Don't Know
>= 4 yr. college	60.1%	28.7%	5.0%	4.2%	2.1%
< 4 yr. college	60.7%	25.5%	5.3%	3.2%	5.4%

Respondent income

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely	Don't Know
<\$50,000	67.5%	19.3%	7.2%	0.1%	5.4%
\$50k-\$100k	61.0%	27.2%	4.8%	2.0%	5.0%
>\$100,000	59.0%	28.5%	5.2%	5.4%	1.9%

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely	Don't Know
Asian	64.8%	26.2%	5.4%	2.4%	1.2%
Black	71.9%	16.5%	2.9%	5.8%	3.0%
Latino	57.6%	29.5%	4.5%	3.3%	5.1%
White	61.1%	27.7%	4.7%	4.0%	2.5%

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
September 12-25, 2024  
Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
University of Southern California  
Cal Poly Pomona  
MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Party identification

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely	Don't Know
Democrat	67.0%	24.5%	4.8%	0.9%	2.8%
Republican	51.5%	32.3%	6.5%	7.0%	2.8%
Ind./something else	56.3%	27.7%	4.1%	6.6%	5.3%

## Crosstabs

Note: Rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

The unemployment rate is...

### Respondent gender

	At historic highs	Higher than last year	Lower than last year	At historic lows	Don't Know
Man	12.1%	30.8%	30.9%	15.4%	10.8%
Woman	14.0%	21.2%	31.1%	11.8%	21.9%

### Respondent age

	At historic highs	Higher than last year	Lower than last year	At historic lows	Don't Know
Age 18-39	14.4%	22.3%	35.7%	7.5%	20.1%
Age 40-60	13.5%	29.2%	26.3%	14.5%	16.4%
Age >60	10.4%	26.1%	31.4%	21.1%	10.9%

### Respondent education

	At historic highs	Higher than last year	Lower than last year	At historic lows	Don't Know
>= 4 yr. college	11.3%	25.9%	33.7%	14.8%	14.3%
< 4 yr. college	15.7%	25.8%	26.5%	11.4%	20.7%

### Respondent income

	At historic highs	Higher than last year	Lower than last year	At historic lows	Don't Know
<\$50,000	18.4%	18.7%	29.8%	8.6%	24.6%
\$50k-\$100k	12.4%	24.8%	33.5%	9.1%	20.3%
>\$100,000	12.0%	28.0%	31.6%	16.6%	11.7%

### Respondent race/ethnicity

	At historic highs	Higher than last year	Lower than last year	At historic lows	Don't Know
Asian	15.9%	29.0%	27.3%	6.3%	21.5%
Black	12.9%	23.0%	36.0%	11.5%	16.5%
Latino	16.0%	23.7%	35.1%	10.9%	14.3%
White	10.2%	25.6%	31.5%	17.4%	15.3%

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
September 12-25, 2024  
Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
University of Southern California  
Cal Poly Pomona  
MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Party identification

	At historic highs	Higher than last year	Lower than last year	At historic lows	Don't Know
Democrat	4.9%	16.1%	42.8%	20.4%	15.9%
Republican	27.6%	35.7%	18.9%	2.9%	14.9%
Ind./something else	13.8%	33.8%	22.0%	11.7%	18.7%

## Crosstabs

Note: Rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding and because the option “I will skip this election” is not displayed in the crosstab tables below.

### Crime in California is...

#### Respondent gender

	At historic highs	Higher than last year	Lower than last year	At historic lows	Don't Know
Man	24.0%	27.7%	30.1%	5.4%	12.8%
Woman	30.2%	21.3%	23.9%	4.0%	20.5%

#### Respondent age

	At historic highs	Higher than last year	Lower than last year	At historic lows	Don't Know
Age 18-39	23.1%	26.0%	25.2%	3.8%	21.9%
Age 40-60	31.3%	25.7%	22.8%	4.8%	15.4%
Age >60	26.7%	20.2%	36.1%	6.0%	11.0%

#### Respondent education

	At historic highs	Higher than last year	Lower than last year	At historic lows	Don't Know
>= 4 yr. college	23.9%	22.8%	29.5%	6.2%	17.7%
< 4 yr. college	32.4%	28.0%	22.6%	20.5%	15.0%

#### Respondent income

	At historic highs	Higher than last year	Lower than last year	At historic lows	Don't Know
<\$50,000	35.9%	19.3%	24.7%	1.7%	18.5%
\$50k-\$100k	22.6%	26.4%	21.7%	4.7%	24.6%
>\$100,000	25.9%	24.3%	31.0%	6.4%	12.4%

#### Respondent race/ethnicity

	At historic highs	Higher than last year	Lower than last year	At historic lows	Don't Know
Asian	24.1%	33.7%	18.9%	2.6%	20.7%
Black	24.6%	16.5%	33.8%	4.5%	20.6%
Latino	29.3%	29.0%	21.8%	1.5%	18.4%
White	24.8%	20.4%	32.6%	6.7%	15.6%

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
September 12-25, 2024  
Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
University of Southern California  
Cal Poly Pomona  
MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Party identification

	At historic highs	Higher than last year	Lower than last year	At historic lows	Don't Know
Democrat	7.5%	22.5%	41.9%	7.9%	20.2%
Republican	59.0%	28.3%	5.1%	0.1%	7.5%
Ind./something else	31.4%	24.2%	21.5%	3.6%	19.2%

Questions for L.A. County residents only (N=311 likely voters living in L.A. County; MoE +/- 5.6% for the L.A. County sample):

Crosstabs

Note: Rows do not sum to 100% due to rounding and because the option “I will skip this election” is not displayed in the crosstab tables below.

If the election for District Attorney of Los Angeles County were held today, which candidate would you vote for?

Respondent gender

	Nathan Hochman	George Gascón	Don't know
Man	52.7%	21.6%	23.4%
Woman	28.7%	18.3%	48.0%

Respondent age

	Nathan Hochman	George Gascón	Don't know
Age 18-39	21.7%	14.8%	55.9%
Age 40-60	46.3%	24.1%	27.6%
Age >60	48.6%	22.4%	27.7%

Respondent education

	Nathan Hochman	George Gascón	Don't know
>= 4-year college degree	35.8%	21.9%	38.1%
< 4-year college degree	38.9%	15.9%	41.1%

Respondent income

	Nathan Hochman	George Gascón	Don't know
<\$50,000	36.3%	24.4%	39.3%
\$50,000-\$100,000	27.6%	20.7%	47.5%
>\$100,000	42.0%	21.1%	31.9%

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Nathan Hochman	George Gascón	Don't know
Asian	51.6%	6.1%	38.9%
Black	38.9%	24.5%	36.7%
Latino	33.1%	14.2%	43.8%
White	36.3%	27.8%	34.5%

Party identification

	Nathan Hochman	George Gascón	Don't know
Democrat	23.7%	27.4%	48.5%
Republican	61.9%	4.6%	31.5%
Independent/Something else	40.6%	18.5%	27.9%



California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
September 12-25, 2024  
Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
University of Southern California  
Cal Poly Pomona  
MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Perceptions of crime: Crime in California is...

	Nathan Hochman	George Gascón	Don't know
At historic highs	59.2%	10.7%	25.2%
Higher than last year	45.4%	12.2%	36.8%
Lower than last year	19.2%	31.3%	45.6%
At historic lows	12.7%	80.5%	6.7%

Crosstabs

Note: Rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

How excited are you about the Los Angeles region hosting the 2028 Summer Olympics?

Respondent gender

	Very Excited	Somewhat excited	Somewhat not excited	Not very excited	Don't Know
Man	32.8%	32.3	6.0%	24.4%	4.6%
Woman	33.7%	36.2%	9.9%	18.2%	1.9%

Respondent age

	Very Excited	Somewhat excited	Somewhat not excited	Not very excited	Don't Know
Age 18-39	26.2%	43.0%	6.4%	18.0%	6.4%
Age 40-60	32.4%	26.8%	16.7%	22.8%	1.3%
Age >60	40.4%	29.1%	6.2%	23.6%	7.9%

Respondent education

	Very Excited	Somewhat excited	Somewhat not excited	Not very excited	Don't Know
>= 4 yr. college	28.4%	37.8%	8.2%	21.6%	4.0%
< 4 yr. college	44.3%	26.1%	7.8%	20.3%	1.5%

Respondent income

	Very Excited	Somewhat excited	Somewhat not excited	Not very excited	Don't Know
<\$50,000	41.1%	36.5%	1.5%	11.9%	9.1%
\$50k-\$100k	33.9%	25.8%	14.5%	23.9%	1.8%
>\$100,000	33.4%	38.6%	6.8%	18.7%	2.5%

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Very Excited	Somewhat excited	Somewhat not excited	Not very excited	Don't Know
Asian	39.1%	27.7%	11.8%	21.5%	0.1%
Black	36.0%	14.9%	10.5%	31.5%	7.2%
Latino	32.3%	41.1%	6.4%	20.2%	0.1%
White	34.7%	32.7%	7.0%	20.7%	4.9%

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
September 12-25, 2024  
Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
University of Southern California  
Cal Poly Pomona  
MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Party identification

	Very Excited	Somewhat excited	Somewhat not excited	Not very excited	Don't Know
Democrat	40.2%	32.4%	7.5%	17.5%	2.5%
Republican	17.6%	41.8%	5.3%	33.7%	1.6%
Ind./something else	33.0%	32.0%	11.2%	18.0%	5.8%

Crosstabs

Note: Rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Los Angeles will host the Olympics in 2028. Public officials have promised a car-free Olympics in order to allow for athletes and others to travel around the region easily to Olympic events.

How feasible is a car-free Olympics in 2028?

Respondent gender

	Very feasible	Somewhat feasible	Somewhat unfeasible	Very unfeasible	Don't Know
Man	11.6%	13.8%	22.5%	48.0%	4.2%
Woman	7.2%	31.1%	13.1%	44.7%	3.8%

Respondent age

	Very feasible	Somewhat feasible	Somewhat unfeasible	Very unfeasible	Don't Know
Age 18-39	11.8%	18.8%	13.7%	54.3%	1.4%
Age 40-60	7.3%	24.9%	21.5%	42.4%	3.9%
Age >60	8.2%	28.0%	16.8%	36.3%	10.7%

Respondent education

	Very feasible	Somewhat feasible	Somewhat unfeasible	Very unfeasible	Don't Know
>= 4 yr. college	8.4%	19.3%	19.0%	48.2%	5.0%
< 4 yr. college	11.3%	30.8%	14.4%	42.1%	1.4%

Respondent income

	Very feasible	Somewhat feasible	Somewhat unfeasible	Very unfeasible	Don't Know
<\$50,000	30.4%	31.6%	10.1%	23.6%	4.4%
\$50k-\$100k	3.5%	24.7%	25.6%	42.7%	3.5%
>\$100,000	6.7%	21.4%	16.4%	51.8%	3.6%

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Very feasible	Somewhat feasible	Somewhat unfeasible	Very unfeasible	Don't Know
Asian	6.0%	13.0%	16.8%	62.1%	2.0%
Black	5.7%	34.1%	7.9%	47.2%	5.1%
Latino	6.8%	28.5%	19.1%	44.0%	1.5%
White	12.4%	18.8%	18.7%	44.3%	5.8%

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
 September 12-25, 2024  
 Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
 N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
 University of Southern California  
 Cal Poly Pomona  
 MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Party identification

	Very feasible	Somewhat feasible	Somewhat unfeasible	Very unfeasible	Don't Know
Democrat	10.4%	23.0%	21.8%	40.9%	3.9%
Republican	2.0%	14.7%	17.5%	64.8%	1.1%
Ind./something else	13.1%	29.4%	9.8%	41.3%	6.4%

Questions for L.A. County residents only (N=311 likely voters living in L.A. County; MoE +/- 5.6% for the L.A. County sample):

Crosstabs

Note: Rows do not sum to 100% due to rounding and because the option “I will skip this election” is not displayed in the crosstab tables below.

A ballot proposition before Los Angeles County voters this November will change county governance. This ballot proposition increases the number of Board of Supervisor districts from 5 to 9, and creates a new elected County Executive.

Will you vote for this ballot proposition?

Respondent gender

	Yes	No	Don't know
Man	40.1%	21.6%	36.5%
Woman	29.9%	15.9%	52.3%

Respondent age

	Yes	No	Don't know
Age 18-39	31.9%	9.1%	56.5%
Age 40-60	35.9%	21.7%	42.4%
Age >60	43.7%	26.7%	27.6%

Respondent education

	Yes	No	Don't know
>= 4-year college degree	32.4%	20.0%	46.0%
< 4-year college degree	42.8%	11.5%	45.0%

Respondent income

	Yes	No	Don't know
<\$50,000	53.4%	14.4%	32.2%
\$50,000-\$100,000	27.0%	8.4%	64.3%
>\$100,000	39.8%	21.9%	36.0%

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Yes	No	Don't know
Asian	38.0%	22.8%	39.2%
Black	33.4%	30.6%	36.0%
Latino	38.2%	18.8%	40.5%
White	35.5%	13.8%	49.9%

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
September 12-25, 2024  
Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
University of Southern California  
Cal Poly Pomona  
MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

Party identification

	Yes	No	Don't know
Democrat	45.2%	7.2%	46.9%
Republican	23.3%	37.3%	39.5%
Independent/Something else	27.4%	20.4%	48.4%

Crosstabs: Note: Rows do not sum to 100% due to rounding.

[Survey experiment: Note the following two questions were randomized so respondents received only one question – asked to all statewide respondents at end of survey]

Version 1 [to ½ respondents]: Do you think Donald Trump should be replaced with a different Republican presidential nominee?

Respondent gender

	Yes	No	Don't know
Man	48.5%	45.4%	6.1%
Woman	52.0%	37.3%	10.7%

Respondent age

	Yes	No	Don't know
Age 18-39	47.3%	42.1%	10.6%
Age 40-60	49.6%	43.5%	6.9%
Age >60	55.1%	38.1%	6.8%

Respondent education

	Yes	No	Don't know
>= 4-year college degree	49.5%	41.9%	8.7%
< 4-year college degree	52.0%	41.5%	6.5%

Respondent income

	Yes	No	Don't know
<\$50,000	43.4%	46.4%	10.2%
\$50,000-\$100,000	58.0%	36.0%	6.0%
>\$100,000	46.8%	45.2%	8.0%

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Yes	No	Don't know
Asian	44.4%	40.0%	15.6%
Black	52.0%	32.7%	15.3%
Latino	55.2%	37.4%	7.4%
White	52.0%	40.6%	7.4%

Party identification

	Yes	No	Don't know
Democrat	73.8%	20.5%	5.7%
Republican	14.8%	81.9%	3.4%
Independent/Something else	40.2%	43.1%	16.8%



Version 2 [to 1/2 respondents]: Joe Biden, who is 81 years old, stepped aside as Democratic nominee for president due to concerns over his age and capacity. Donald Trump is 78 years old, nearly the same age as Joe Biden.

Do you think Donald Trump should be replaced with a different Republican presidential nominee?

Respondent gender

	Yes	No	Don't know
Man	47.3%	48.6%	4.1%
Woman	53.8%	36.7%	9.4%

Respondent age

	Yes	No	Don't know
Age 18-39	56.9%	34.9%	8.2%
Age 40-60	44.9%	48.3%	6.8%
Age >60	51.2%	43.5%	5.3%

Respondent education

	Yes	No	Don't know
>= 4-year college degree	48.2%	44.1%	7.6%
< 4-year college degree	56.4%	37.9%	5.7%

Respondent income

	Yes	No	Don't know
<\$50,000	51.3%	35.4%	13.3%
\$50,000-\$100,000	57.6%	35.8%	6.7%
>\$100,000	48.5%	45.3%	6.1%

Respondent race/ethnicity

	Yes	No	Don't know
Asian	53.0%	36.1%	10.9%
Black	37.4%	56.8%	5.8%
Latino	49.6%	45.1%	5.3%
White	55.4%	37.1%	7.5%

Party identification

	Yes	No	Don't know
Democrat	74.4%	16.8%	8.8%
Republican	13.6%	83.0%	3.4%
Independent/Something else	47.7%	45.0%	7.3%

California Elections & Policy Poll (CEPP)  
September 12-25, 2024  
Contact: Dr. Christian Grose, USC, [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu)  
N=1685 likely voters, statewide poll

Center for Urban Politics and Policy, CSU Long Beach  
University of Southern California  
Cal Poly Pomona  
MoE +/-2.4 for statewide poll

### Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the Center for Urban Politics and Policy at California State University, Long Beach; the University of Southern California Dornsife School of Letters, Arts, and Sciences; the USC Price School of Public Policy; and California Polytechnic University, Pomona. We would like to thank Dean Deborah Thien of CSU Long Beach, Kathryn Perkins of CSU Long Beach, and Ty Kim of CSU Long Beach for support for the poll. We also would like to thank Paul McQuiston, Nina Raffio, Ileana Wachtel, Lance Ignon, and Christian Hetrick (all of USC) for support for the poll and especially community engagement around the poll. Finally, we thank Professor Matt Lesenyie of CSU Long Beach and Aloe Villagrana for writing and contributing questions to the survey. The polling and political data firm Data Viewpoint conducted the survey and provided voter file data.

The California Elections and Policy Congressional Polls (CEPP) Research Team:



**[Raquel Centeno](#)** is a Ph.D. candidate in the Political Science and International Relations department at the University of Southern California studying American politics. Raquel specializes in the areas of public opinion, political psychology, Latino politics, and political behavior. Her dissertation focuses on how partisan and racial group identities jointly influence partisan polarization. Her other research is motivated by questions of how voters' group identities impact their political perceptions and behavior, such as how different primary systems influence political behavior across racial and ethnic subgroups of voters. She has conducted multiple, original surveys as part of her research. For more information on Raquel, please visit <https://racenteno.github.io/>



**[Dr. Jarred Cuellar](#)** is an assistant professor of political science at the California State Polytechnic University, Pomona. Dr. Cuellar's research focuses on American politics, specifically Latino political behavior within the United States. He is a native of Los Angeles County and was raised in Bellflower. His degrees include a BA from UC Irvine, a MA from the University of Arkansas, and a PhD from USC. He has worked on multiple polls and surveys; and earlier this year took his students on an experiential learning visit to the 2024 Iowa caucus.



**[Dr. Christian R. Grose](#)** is Professor of Political Science and International Relations in USC Dornsife College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences and Professor of Public Policy at the University of Southern California in the USC Price School of Public Policy. He is the author of *Congress in Black and White: Race and Representation in Washington and at Home* and over 60 articles and reports, including in the *American Political Science Review*, the *American Journal of Political Science*, the *Journal of Politics*; and *Legislative Studies Quarterly*. He has conducted numerous surveys of the California electorate, surveys of other states, and cities within California. His polls have accurately predicted winners in state, local, and district elections and Dr. Grose's polling is known for its quality and accuracy, including his 2022 poll that correctly predicted the outcome of the Long Beach mayoral election. He is originally from North Carolina, but has lived in California for more than a decade. He can be reached at [drchristiangrose@gmail.com](mailto:drchristiangrose@gmail.com) or [cgrose@usc.edu](mailto:cgrose@usc.edu).

**[Dr. Matthew Mendez Garcia](#)** is Executive Director of the Center for Urban Politics and Policy at CSU Long Beach, where he is also Associate Professor. The Center's polling in collaboration with USC has been remarkably accurate in previous elections. He is a native Californian who holds a Ph.D. in political science from the University of Southern California. Professor Mendez studies American politics, with a focus on representation, legislative behavior, race and ethnicity, political behavior, intersectionality, and immigration. In 2016, he received the award for Best Dissertation from the American Political Science Association's Organized Section on Race, Ethnicity, and Politics. His research has been published in journals such as *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, *Political Research Quarterly*, and *California Journal of Politics and Policy*.