Hello, my name is ____ and I’m calling from ____, a public opinion research firm. (IF RESPONDENT ANSWERS IN SPANISH, RESPOND WITH SPANISH LANGUAGE INTRODUCTION OR HAND OFF TO SPANISH-CAPABLE INTERVIEWER.) We’re conducting a public opinion survey about issues that concern residents of California. We are not selling anything, and we will not ask for a donation or contribution of any kind. May I please speak to ____? (MUST SPEAK TO VOTER LISTED; VERIFY VOTER LIVES AT ADDRESS LISTED; OTHERWISE, TERMINATE.)

A. Before we begin, I need to know if I have reached you on a cell phone, and if so, are you in a place where you can talk safely without endangering yourself or others? (IF NOT ON A CELL PHONE, ASK: Do you own a cell phone?)

Yes, cell and can talk safely -------------------------------- 51%
Yes, cell but cannot talk safely ------------------------- TERMINATE
No, not on cell, but own one ------------------------------- 49%
No, not on cell and do not own one ------------------------ 0%
(DON’T READ) DK/NA/REFUSED------------------------- TERMINATE

1. Now I’m going to read a list of people, organizations and places. As I read each one, please tell me whether your impression of that person, organization or place is generally favorable or unfavorable. If you don’t recognize a name or if you have heard about the person, group or place, but do not have enough information to offer an opinion, just say so. (IF FAVORABLE/UNFAVORABLE, ASK: “Is that very or somewhat (FAVORABLE/ UNFAVORABLE)?”)

(ALWAYS ASK ITEM a FIRST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRD OF/ DON'T KNOW OF</th>
<th>NEVER TOTAL FAV</th>
<th>TOTAL UNFAV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY FAV</td>
<td>SMWT FAV</td>
<td>SMWT UNFAV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor Gavin Newsom</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(RANDOMIZE ALL OTHERS)

[ ]b. The California State Legislature------------------------ 11% ---- 31% ---- 11% ---- 28% ---- 12% ---- 7% 42% 39%
[ ]c. California Attorney General
    Rob Bonta ------------------------ 11% ---- 16% ---- 7% ---- 24% ---- 23% ---- 19% 28% 31%
[ ]d. The California Energy Commission------------------------ 7% ---- 19% ---- 15% ---- 23% ---- 23% ---- 14% 26% 38%
[ ]e. Consumer Watchdog ------------------------ 11% ---- 23% ---- 7% ---- 6% ---- 26% ---- 27% 33% 14%
4. As you may know, Governor Newsom called a special session of the State Legislature to address the high price of gasoline in California. During this special session, one proposal being considered by the Governor and others is (ASK SPLIT SAMPLE A: “a price gouging rebate”) (ASK SPLIT SAMPLE B ONLY: “a windfall profits cap”) on oil refineries in California when the price of gasoline reaches an abnormally high level in California and oil refineries post abnormally high profits. Under this proposal, the state would set a limit on how much oil companies can profit from refining oil into gasoline, cap those profits and return these excess profits to taxpayers via rebates — potentially similar to those the state has begun depositing in millions of residents’ accounts this month.

Based on this description, would you support or oppose the state of California establishing (ASK SPLIT SAMPLE A: “a price gouging rebate”) (ASK SPLIT SAMPLE B ONLY: “a windfall profits cap”) on oil refineries in California when the price of gasoline reaches an abnormally high level? (IF SUPPORT/OPPOSE, ASK: “Is that strongly (SUPPORT/OPPOSE) or just somewhat?”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A: PRICE</th>
<th>B: WINDFALL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GOUGING REBATE</td>
<td>PROFITS CAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat support</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OPPOSE</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat oppose</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DON’T READ) DK/NA</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I AM NOW GOING TO READ YOU SOME STATEMENTS FROM (ROTATE) [ ] SUPPORTERS AND [ ] OPPONENTS OF THIS PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH (ASK SPLIT SAMPLE A: “A PRICE GOUGING REBATE”) (ASK SPLIT SAMPLE B ONLY: “A WINDFALL PROFITS CAP”) ON CALIFORNIA OIL REFINERIES.
5. (ROs AND Q9) I am going to read you statements made by supporters of this proposal. After hearing each statement, please tell me whether you find it very convincing, somewhat convincing, or not a convincing reason to support it. If you do not believe the statement, please tell me that too.

a. (PRICE GOUGING) This price gouging rebate will help to stop oil companies' from manipulating the price of gas. Big Oil's five refineries control 97 percent of the gas pumped in California, which they have used to make billions in record profits while Californians struggle to fill their gas tanks and pay their bills.

b. (CA PRICES) Californians pay much higher gas prices than the rest of the nation because oil companies intentionally manipulate supplies to drive up the price. Nonpartisan, independent economic studies report that California's environmental rules and taxes add 69 cents per gallon, but oil companies' refineries are adding two dollars and fifty cents per gallon—this outrageous price fixing is costs us every time we fill up our tanks.

c. (PROFITS & REBATES) California oil refiners have typically made 32 cents per gallon in profits over the last 20 years, but this year they are making over one dollar per gallon in profits—a 200 percent increase in profits. This price gouging rebate would cap profits over 50 cents per gallon and return it directly to drivers.

(ASK SPLIT SAMPLE B ONLY)

(AK SPLIT SAMPLE A ONLY)
(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)
(ROTATE Q6 AND Q5)

6. [FIRST/NEXT], I am going to read you statements made by opponents of this proposal. After hearing each statement, please tell me whether you find it very convincing, somewhat convincing, or not a convincing reason to oppose it. If you do not believe the statement, please tell me that too. (RANDOMIZE)

[ ]a. (TAXES, REGS & RED TAPE) Raising taxes on oil companies will not bring down gas prices, and could result in even higher prices as those costs will likely get passed on to consumers. The most effective way to bring down prices is to cut overregulation and government red tape, and get Sacramento politicians out of the way to let the law of supply and demand and the free market operate. ------------------------ 31% ---- 22% ----- 24% ----- 19% ------ 4% 53%

(ASK SPLIT SAMPLE A ONLY)
[ ]b. (TAXES & POLICIES) Californians pay the nation’s highest gas prices because the Governor and state legislature keep raising taxes and fees and passing laws that force refineries to close, reducing the supply of gasoline. This proposal is also part of the Governor’s scheme to eliminate gas powered vehicles and force all of us to drive electric cars. ------------------------ 34% ---- 17% ----- 23% ----- 23% ------ 3% 51%

(ASK SPLIT SAMPLE B ONLY)
[ ]c. (FACTORS) Beside taxes and regulations, gas prices are high because of inflation, the war in Ukraine and OPEC reducing the global supply of oil. Raising taxes on oil refineries does nothing to address the real causes of high gas prices, and if this proposal is approved the costs will be passed in higher prices at the pump. ------------------------ 21% ---- 27% ----- 30% ----- 17% ------ 5% 49%
(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)

7. Having heard these statements, let me ask you again, do you support or oppose the state of California establishing (ASK SPLIT SAMPLE A: “a price gouging rebate”) (ASK SPLIT SAMPLE B ONLY: “a windfall profits cap”) on oil refineries in California when the price of gasoline reaches an abnormally high level? (IF SUPPORT/OPPOSE, ASK: “Is that strongly (SUPPORT/OPPOSE) or just somewhat?”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A: PRICE GOUGING</th>
<th>B: WINDFALL PROFITS CAP</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat support</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Support</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL OPPOSE</th>
<th>35%</th>
<th>32%</th>
<th>34%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat oppose</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(DON’T READ) DK/NA ------------------------------------- 6% ------------ 6% ------------- 6%

HERE ARE MY LAST QUESTIONS, AND THEY ARE FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES ONLY.

9. How would you describe yourself politically: are you liberal, moderate, or conservative? (IF LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE, ASK: "Is that very (LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE) or just somewhat?”)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very liberal</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat liberal</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat conservative</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very conservative</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DK/NA/REFUSED)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. What was the last level of school you completed?

- High school graduate or less: 9%
- Some college/vocational school: 29%
- College (4 years): 35%
- Post-graduate work: 26%
- **(DON’T READ) DK/Refused**: 2%

11. With which ethnic group do you identify yourself: Hispanic or Latino, Black or African American, white or Caucasian, Asian or Pacific Islander, multiracial, or another ethnic or racial background that I did not mention?

- Hispanic/Latino: 23%
- Black/African American: 8%
- White/Caucasian: 52%
- Asian/Pacific Islander: 9%
- Multiracial: 2%
- Another ethnic or racial background: 2%
- **(DON’T READ) DK/Refused**: 4%

THANK AND TERMINATE
GENDER BY OBSERVATION:
- Male: 48%
- Female: 52%
- Non-binary: 0%

LANGUAGE OF INTERVIEW:
- English: 92%
- Spanish: 8%

PARTY REGISTRATION:
- Democrat: 48%
- Republican: 27%
- No Party Preference: 16%
- Other: 9%

FLAGS
- P14: 27%
- G14: 44%
- P16: 53%
- G16: 74%
- P18: 50%
- G18: 77%
- P20: 65%
- G20: 93%
- R21: 85%
- P22: 60%
- BLANK: 0%

REGION
- LA: 24%
- LA Area: 22%
- Bay Area: 22%
- San Diego: 10%
- Sac’to/North: 10%
- Central Valley/Central Coast: 12%

DMA/MEDIA MARKET
- LA: 45%
- SF: 22%
- SD: 10%
- SAC: 10%
- OTHER: 12%

AGE
- 18-24: 7%
- 25-29: 7%
- 30-34: 7%
- 35-39: 8%
- 40-44: 8%
- 45-49: 7%
- 50-54: 8%
- 55-59: 10%
- 60-64: 8%
- 65-74: 17%
- 75+: 13%

OWN/RENT
- Homeowners: 60%
- Renters: 40%

FOREIGN BORN
- Yes: 17%
- No: 83%