



David Binder Research

44 Page Street, Suite 404 • San Francisco, California 94102  
800-905-7330 • 415-621-7655 • F: 415-621-7663 • db-research.com

To: Interested Parties  
From: David Binder Research  
Date: July 14, 2008  
Re: Richmond Voters Support Further Environmental Review and Aggressively Limiting Dirtier Oil Processing

---

A recent voter survey designed to understand the public's opinion towards Chevron's proposed project at its Richmond oil refinery demonstrates the following<sup>1</sup>:

- A majority of Richmond voters (54%) feel Chevron and its refinery has a negative contribution on their quality of life. Only one-third say the impact is positive, with the remainder unsure.
- An overwhelming majority of voters (73%) support the City Council delaying a decision until the environmental and health impacts of refining heavier, dirtier crude oil are fully reviewed.
- A majority of voters (57%) would become more favorable towards the City Council were the council to seek to limit pollution from the proposed refinery project by aggressively limiting the processing of heavier, dirtier crude oil. Only 11% would become less favorable, while the remainder is unsure.
- Three-fourths of voters say it is extremely or very important that negotiations over which projects to be funded by Chevron through an agreement with City Council be determined in an open public process.

### ***Voters: Negative Views of Chevron and Its Refinery***

Voters feel Chevron and its refinery contributes negatively to their quality of life, with a majority (54%) saying it has a negative contribution to the quality of life in Richmond. More than one-quarter (27%) feel the contribution has been very negative, whereas only about half as many (14%) feel the contribution of Chevron and its refinery to the quality of life in Richmond has been very positive. (13% don't know or say Chevron's contribution is a net equal.)

Further, when given a one-sentence statement made on behalf of supporters and opponents of the Chevron plant, half of the voters surveyed agree more with opponents than supporters. The opponents' argument is that the toxic emissions and air pollution cause health problems, reduce property values and cause neighborhood blight. In comparison, only 35% agree with the supporters of the refinery that say it's a crucial part of the Richmond community, generating tax revenue and jobs for the community. Importantly, those that agree with the opponents have a

---

<sup>1</sup> David Binder Research surveyed 400 likely voters in the City of Richmond between July 8<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup>, 2008, with a margin of error of  $\pm 4.9\%$ .

greater intensity behind their opinion, with 30% saying they agree with opponents much more and only 15% saying they agree with supporters much more.

### ***Voters to City Council: Delay Project & Limit Its Pollution***

Voters strongly support the City Council delaying a decision on the proposed project until the environmental and health impacts of refining heavier, dirtier crude oil is fully reviewed by the City. In a striking show of the depth of support, 57% **strongly** support delaying the decision, and a total of 73% support the delay. In total, only 20% of voters oppose the delay, with 7% unsure.

It appears the image of the City Council would improve were they to seek to limit pollution. Were the City Council to seek to limit the pollution from Chevron's expansion project by aggressively limiting the processing of heavier, dirtier crude oil, 57% say their opinion of the council would become more favorable. Only 7% say they would become much less favorable, whereas nearly one-third (32%) would become much more favorable.

### ***Voters: Open Up Negotiations On Local Projects***

A large majority (56%) have heard "nothing at all" about the negotiation between the City Council and Chevron to provide funding for local projects, while at the same time the City Council will be voting on a project to expand the range of crude oils it can refine at its Richmond oil refinery. In total, 80% have heard only "a little" or "nothing at all", and only 20% have heard "a lot" or "some" about the negotiations.

Although voters have heard very little about the negotiations, they have extremely strong opinions on whether the process should be an open public process. Three-fourth of voters say it is "extremely or "very" important for the potential projects and programs to be funded be determined in an open public process. Only 21% place less importance on this, with 4% unsure.

## Appendix: Survey Questions and Results

- ❖ In your opinion, do you think Chevron and its refinery in Richmond has a positive or negative contribution to the quality of life for Richmond residents? IF POSITIVE / NEGATIVE: Is that very POSITIVE/NEGATIVE, or just somewhat?

VERY POSITIVE	14	→33%
SOMEWHAT POSITIVE	19	
SOMEWHAT NEGATIVE	27	→54%
VERY NEGATIVE	27	
NET EQUAL (VOL)	6	
DON'T KNOW	7	

---

- ❖ Now I'm going to read you two statements that people make about Chevron refinery. (ROTATE PARAGRAPHS)

Supporters of the refinery say that it's a crucial part of the Richmond community, generating tax revenue and jobs for the community.

Opponents of the refinery say that the toxic emissions and air pollution cause health problems, reduce property values and cause neighborhood blight.

With whom do you agree more – supporters or opponents? (IF SUPPORTERS/OPPONENTS: Is that much more, or just somewhat?)

SUPPORTERS, MUCH MORE	16	→35%
SUPPORTERS, SOMEWHAT	19	
OPPONENTS, SOMEWHAT	20	→50%
OPPONENTS, MUCH MORE	30	
BOTH EQUALLY (VOL)	11	
DON'T KNOW	4	

---

- ❖ If you learned that the environmental and health impacts of refining heavier, dirtier crude oil had not been fully reviewed by the City, would you support or oppose the City Council delaying a decision on the proposed project until such a review can be completed? (IF CHOICE: is that strongly, or just somewhat?)

STRONGLY SUPPORT	57	→73%
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT	16	
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE	5	→20%
STRONGLY OPPOSE	15	
DON'T KNOW	7	

---

- ❖ If the City Council sought to limit pollution from Chevron's expansion project by aggressively limiting the processing of heavier, dirtier crude oil, would your opinion towards the City Council become more favorable or less favorable or would it make no difference to you?  
(IF MORE / LESS FAVORABLE, FOLLOW-UP: Is that much more or just somewhat?)

MORE FAVORABLE, MUCH	32	→57%
MORE FAVORABLE, SOMEWHAT	25	
LESS FAVORABLE, SOMEWHAT	4	→11%
LESS FAVORABLE, MUCH	7	
NO DIFFERENCE	26	
DON'T KNOW	6	

---

- ❖ The City Council is negotiating an agreement for Chevron to provide funding for local projects, while at the same time the City Council will be voting on a project to expand the range of crude oils it can refine at its Richmond oil refinery.

How much have you heard about this negotiation —a lot, some, just a little, or nothing at all?

A LOT	7	→20%
SOME	13	
A LITTLE	24	→80%
NOTHING AT ALL	56	
DON'T KNOW	<1	

---

- ❖ How important do you think it is for the potential projects and programs to be funded be determined in an open public process – extremely important, very, fairly, just somewhat, or not at all important?

EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	48	→75%
VERY IMPORTANT	27	
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	16	→18%
A LITTLE IMPORTANT	2	
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT	3	
DON'T KNOW	4	

---