

**C A L I F O R N I A 2 0 1 8**  
**INITIATIVE EDITORIAL**  
**SCORECARD**

**KLINK**  
C A M P A I G N S  
public affairs • strategic communications

**FORWARD**  
**OBSERVER**

**October 16, 2018 Edition**

Forward Observer and Klink Campaigns developed the 2018 California Initiative Editorial Scorecard to keep track of editorials for and against the 11 statewide initiatives on this November’s ballot. We will update the scorecard weekly with ballot measure endorsements (pro and con) from the top 20 California newspapers by circulation. The fifth edition of the California Initiative Editorial Scorecard is based on 164 editorials thus far.

<b>2018 California Initiative Editorial Endorsement Scorecard</b>		
Proposition	Yes	No
Proposition 1 (Housing Bond)	9	8
Proposition 2 (Tax Revenue for Homeless Prevention)	10	7
Proposition 3 (Water Bond)	3	14
Proposition 4 (Children’s Hospitals bond)	8	7
Proposition 5 (Property Tax Transfers)	9	7
Proposition 6 (Gas Tax Repeal)	7	12
Proposition 7 (Repeals Daylight Savings Time)	2	8
Proposition 8 (Kidney Dialysis Clinic Requirements)	0	11
Proposition 10 (Rent Control Regulations)	2	17
Proposition 11 (Ambulance Employees Regulations)	15	1
Proposition 12 (Animal Space Requirements)	3	4

## Endorsements from the Top 20 California Papers

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	11	12
Los Angeles Times	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>
San Francisco Chronicle	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
San Diego Union Tribune	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">No</a>		<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	
Orange County Register	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>			<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	
The Mercury News	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>
Sacramento Bee	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
The Mercury News East Bay Times	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>
La Opinión						<a href="#">No</a>		<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>		
Riverside Press-Enterprise	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>			<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	
Fresno Bee	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>				<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	
Santa Rosa Press Democrat	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
Los Angeles Daily News	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>			<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	
Ventura County Star					<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>		<a href="#">No</a>		
Torrance Daily Breeze	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>			<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	
Modesto Bee	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>				<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>		
Palm Springs Desert Sun			<a href="#">No</a>			<a href="#">No</a>					
Long Beach Press-Telegram	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>			<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	
Bakersfield Californian	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
San Bernardino Sun	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>			<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	
Inland Valley Daily Bulletin	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>			<a href="#">No</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>	

The following excerpts are from endorsement editorials that appeared online or in print since our last edition:

### **Proposition 3**

Los Angeles Times – No

*“Proposition 3 is not merely a request for money, but an effort to force taxpayers all across the state to pay costs that ought to be borne by the private or regional interests that will benefit. That kind of cost-shifting isn’t always easy to spot in a bond measure. In this case it is.” [Link](#)*

Palm Springs Desert Sun – No

*“Proposition 3 is pay-to-play legislation, with large chunks of its funding earmarked for agencies whose planned use of the funds would almost solely benefit large private firms. Those who agreed to help fund the initiative’s promotion are in line for big payouts from its proceeds. California should be drawing up and funding key infrastructure water projects primarily based on those who benefit paying the lion’s share of costs rather than lumping another massive sum, yet again, on all state taxpayers.” [Link](#)*

### **Proposition 5**

Ventura County Star – No

*“Prop. 13 created two classes of Californians — an older gentry of longtime property owners with low tax rates, and younger generations that may be paying twice as much tax for the same house next door. It’s hard to imagine Prop. 5 not widening that gap.” [Link](#)*

### **Proposition 6**

Palm Springs Desert Sun – No

*“Rather than stop the numerous projects already being funded and that have gotten underway thanks to SB1, state voters should reject the cynical repeal measure that is Proposition 6 and keep the ball rolling when it comes to better roads.” [Link](#)*

## **Proposition 7**

Ventura County Star – Yes

*"That said, we must concede we've grown weary of the twice-yearly changing of our clocks. Now that the issue has advanced to the ballot with bipartisan support, we think Prop. 7 merits a yes vote." [Link](#)*

## **Proposition 10**

Ventura County Star – No

*"The main reason for California's affordable housing shortage is simple: too much demand and not enough supply. Prop. 10 does nothing to address that disparity and indeed could make it worse." [Link](#)*