

**The Campaign Civility Project**  
(Contact Carl Luna: [cluna@sdccd.edu](mailto:cluna@sdccd.edu) / 619-507-7246 for information)

**Alvarez: Faulconner Focuses Downtown**

David Alvarez for Mayor

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5HGfvbXrHW8>

Scoring Sheet Alvarez 1-29-14

	Carl	Jeff	John	TOTAL	GRADE
TRUE	-2	2	0		
RELEVANT	0	3	4		
FAIR	-2	3	2		
Totals	-4	8	6	10/3 = 3.33	B-

**Carl:**

**TRUE:** While ad lists references for claims it gives no context. Why are funding developers (who – what projects), subsidies for corporations (whom?) bad? When and how much did Faulconner cut fire and police? Wasn't this part of the across the board reductions done during the budget crisis? Seems distortive. Todd Gloria endorsement is truest statement.

**RELEVANT:** Talks about detailed plan to create jobs and references campaign website. Would have been better to focus ad on specifics of plans. Claims about Faulconner funding developers and subsidizing corporations without context irrelevant. No way to tell if Alvarez opposed these decisions at the time or what they amounted to. Gloria endorsement relevant. Purpose, tone of ad is to attack Faulconner's character without really substantiated support.

**FAIR:** Ad isn't informative as much as ad hominem. Who are the menacing old white guys in the opening? More uncivil than civil.

**John:**

**TRUE:** - 0 - Saying doesn't make it so. The usual "he's bad I'm good" campaign blather. BUT no way to check it's accuracy.

**RELEVANT – 4 –** All issues are relevant.

**FAIR: 2 –** Delivered in a civil tone but extremely negative.

**Jeff:**

**True—2—**This appears to be the classic, us vs. them, downtown interests support vs. neighborhoods. The ad does provide attributions to check on downtown friends, developers, etc., but none for the claim that Faulconer cut PD and Fire. There is no back

up, no voting record for any of the things the ad claims David has done or will do, such as restoring funding for PD and Fire and investment in roads and infrastructure. The ad talks about a detailed plan for jobs and shows the campaign website which I visited but could not find it.

Relevant—3—With the exception of the downtown vs. neighborhoods, an us vs. them situation, the issues are real and relevant.

Fair—3—Civil but with the us vs. them edge.

***Faulconner AD: We Need Progress In San Diego***

Faculonner for Mayor

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HVJENBNGAA>

Scoring Faulconer –“Don’t go Back” 1-29-14

	Carl	Jeff	John	TOTAL	GRADE
TRUE	-2	1	0		
RELEVANT	-3	2	2		
FAIR	-3	1	0		
Totals	-8	4	6	$2/3 = .67$	C

**Carl:**

**TRUE:** Unions have never ruled San Diego nor were they alone responsible for city financial problems. We had GOP majorities on City Council & GOP Mayor during those times. Lavish pensions is relative claim.

**RELEVANT:** Alvarez age irrelevant. Blaming Alvarez for Crumbling streets that crumbled before he was on the council is irrelevant.

**FAIR:** “Union Cronies” and “Union Bosses” is a deliberate slur. Ad is ad hominem attack on Alvarez. Tone, colorization is classic attack-ad scare motif. Blaming Alvarez for Crumbling streets that crumbled before he was on the council – but Faulconner was, is chutzpah. “Won’t Fight For Us” is divisive.

**John:**

TRUE – 0 - Yes Alvarez is 33 years old but does that mean he can’t make responsible judgements and decisions – Is age an issue? Charging his opponent with all the city’s ills is nonsense. Prove it – this ad doesn’t.

RELEVANT - The real relevancy is the large amounts of money being contributed to both campaigns...and who give to whom has relevance but doesn't back it up here.

FAIR – 0 - The accusation that 'he won't fight for us' raises questionable issues---is this a hidden meaning---them being the voters south of I-8 ---minority communities....no attempt to explain.

**Jeff:**

True—1—The point is given for the attribution of the campaign contributions. However, the reference to Alvarez's age is meaningless and in fact could very well backfire with younger voters, a risk they are obviously willing to take as older voters tend to turn out in greater numbers. Presuming we will "go back" and that he is somehow responsible for infrastructure problems is disingenuous at best.

Relevant—2—The issues, besides Alvarez's age are relevant but the context is deceiving.

Fair—1—The age issue is unfair, the supposition that we will go backwards is unfair and assumption that Alvarez will do all of the union's bidding is unfair—no different than the Alvarez contention that Faulconer will do all of the bidding for developers and "downtown interests."