Rethink Priorities is an independent, non-partisan, non-profit 501(c)3 policy think tank that does polling and policy analysis. Rethink Priorities is not funded by any candidate or political party committee and does not poll on behalf of any political candidate or party. This poll was conducted out of general interest, to test Rethink Priorities’s capabilities to accurately poll and forecast ballot initiatives of interest.

Rethink Priorities conducted a state poll of California ballot initiatives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Support in Poll*</th>
<th>80% NMCI**</th>
<th>Chance of passing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA Prop 14</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>45.2% - 66.0%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Prop 15</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>46.7% - 66.4%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Prop 16</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>30.4% - 49.4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Prop 17</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>53.7% - 68.7%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Prop 18</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>40.1% - 54.6%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Prop 20</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>35.0% - 55.2%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Prop 21</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>34.5% - 59.2%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Prop 22</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>41.1% - 59.3%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Prop 23</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>45.2% - 65.5%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Prop 25</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>50.7% - 67.6%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Poll is of likely California voters, weighted to be representative of California by race, age, gender, education, income, and 2016 Presidential vote.

**NMCI = NaiveModeled ConfidenceInterval. NMCIs use polling results to predict actual election results using data from the poll alone plus historical information about polling accuracy. They do not use other information, like other polls, opposition spending, etc. NMCI are not just the CIs implied by the raw polling margin of error. An 80% NMCI from x to y is meant to imply that there is an 80% chance that the true value as observed on election day will fall between x and y.
Results Summary

CA Prop 14 (52.3% support, 67% chance of passing)

California Proposition 14 “Stem Cell Research Institute Bond Initiative” (2020) has 52.3% of likely voters in support, 32.2% in opposition, and 15.5% undecided in our poll of N=885 likely California voters. The raw weighted margin of error is +/- 4.5 points.

Using this polling data and historical information about polling accuracy and trendlines between polling and actual results, we expect an 80% chance that the true support on election day to be between 45.2% and 66.0%. Further, we forecast a 67% chance Prop 14 will pass on election day.

CA Prop 15 (60.6% support, 71% chance of passing)

California Proposition 15 “Tax on Commercial and Industrial Properties for Education and Local Government Funding Initiative” (2020) has 60.6% of likely voters in support, 27.5% in opposition, and 11.9% undecided in our poll of N=875 likely California voters. The raw weighted margin of error is +/- 4.7 points.

Using this polling data and historical information about polling accuracy and trendlines between polling and actual results, we expect an 80% chance that the true support on election day to be between 46.7% and 66.4%. Further, we forecast a 71% chance Prop 15 will pass on election day.

CA Prop 16 (46.1% support, 19% chance of passing)

California Proposition 16 “Repeal Proposition 209 Affirmative Action Amendment” (2020) has 46.1% of likely voters in support, 41.6% in opposition, and 12.3% undecided in our poll of N=869 likely California voters. The raw weighted margin of error is +/- 4.8 points.

Using this polling data and historical information about polling accuracy and trendlines between polling and actual results, we expect an 80% chance that the true support on election day to be between 30.4% and 49.4%. Further, we forecast a 19% chance Prop 16 will pass on election day.

CA Prop 17 (61.0% support, 90% chance of passing)
California Proposition 17 “Voting Rights Restoration for Persons on Parole Amendment” (2020) has 61.0% of likely voters in support, 29.7% in opposition, and 9.3% undecided in our poll of N=879 likely California voters. The raw weighted margin of error is +/- 4.7 points.

Using this polling data and historical information about polling accuracy and trendlines between polling and actual results, we expect an 80% chance that the true support on election day to be between 53.7% and 68.7%. Further, we forecast a 90% chance Prop 17 will pass on election day.

CA Prop 18 (48.0% support, 38% chance of passing)

California Proposition 18 “Primary Voting for 17-Year-Olds Amendment” (2020) has 48.0% of likely voters in support, 48.5% in opposition, and 3.5% undecided in our poll of N=878 likely California voters. The raw weighted margin of error is +/- 4.9 points.

Using this polling data and historical information about polling accuracy and trendlines between polling and actual results, we expect an 80% chance that the true support on election day to be between 40.1% and 54.6%. Further, we forecast a 38% chance Prop 18 will pass on election day.

CA Prop 20 (53.2% support, 34% chance of passing)

California Proposition 20 “Criminal Sentencing, Parole, and DNA Collection Initiative” (2020) has 53.2% of likely voters in support, 32.2% in opposition, and 14.6% undecided in our poll of N=871 likely California voters. The raw weighted margin of error is +/- 4.8 points.

Using this polling data and historical information about polling accuracy and trendlines between polling and actual results, we expect an 80% chance that the true support on election day to be between 35.0% and 55.2%. Further, we forecast a 34% chance Prop 20 will pass on election day.

CA Prop 21 (47.4% support, 41% chance of passing)

California Proposition 21 “Rent Control Initiative” (2020) has 47.4% of likely voters in support, 33.7% in opposition, and 18.9% undecided in our poll of N=874 likely California voters. The raw weighted margin of error is +/- 4.7 points.
Using this polling data and historical information about polling accuracy and trendlines between polling and actual results, we expect an 80% chance that the true support on election day to be between 34.5% and 59.2%. Further, we forecast a 41% chance Prop 21 will pass on election day.

CA Prop 22 (52.6% support, 51% chance of passing)

California Proposition 22 “App-Based Drivers as Contractors and Labor Policies Initiative” (2020) has 52.6% of likely voters in support, 40.8% in opposition, and 6.5% undecided in our poll of N=867 likely California voters. The raw weighted margin of error is +/- 4.8 points.

Using this polling data and historical information about polling accuracy and trendlines between polling and actual results, we expect an 80% chance that the true support on election day to be between 41.1% and 59.3%. Further, we forecast a 51% chance Prop 22 will pass on election day.

CA Prop 23 (52.7% support, 67% chance of passing)

California Proposition 23 “Dialysis Clinic Requirements Initiative” (2020) has 52.7% of likely voters in support, 31.9% in opposition, and 15.3% undecided in our poll of N=869 likely California voters. The raw weighted margin of error is +/- 4.5 points.

Using this polling data and historical information about polling accuracy and trendlines between polling and actual results, we expect an 80% chance that the true support on election day to be between 45.2% and 65.5%. Further, we forecast a 67% chance Prop 23 will pass on election day.

CA Prop 25 (59.2% support, 82% chance of passing)

California Proposition 25 “Replace Cash Bail with Risk Assessments Referendum” (2020) has 59.2% of likely voters in support, 31.5% in opposition, and 9.3% undecided in our poll of N=875 likely California voters. The raw weighted margin of error is +/- 4.6 points.

Using this polling data and historical information about polling accuracy and trendlines between polling and actual results, we expect an 80% chance that the true support on election day to be between 50.7% and 67.6%. Further, we forecast a 82% chance Prop 25 will pass on election day.
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Methods

Survey Design

This poll was designed on Surveymonkey. The survey was 45 questions long and took an average of 9 minutes to complete. Questions consisted of matters of policy and relevant demographics.

We worded questions to describe the proposition, explain in a single sentence why supporters supported the proposition, and explained in a single sentence why opposers opposed the proposition. This was done to simulate access to electoral information available to respondents via campaigning and the election process. Wording for the questions is in Appendix 1.

Survey Deployment

This poll was conducted entirely on Prolific, an online platform where people are recruited and paid to complete surveys. The platform is non-political and non-partisan.

The survey was live on 20 October 2020 between 3pm and 10pm Central time.

Our survey was advertised to participants on the platform as “A Survey about Attitudes” with the description “In this survey you will be asked a number of questions regarding your attitudes to certain policy proposals. You will also be asked some basic demographic information.” The nature of the survey was not disclosed any further, so we would not expect any additional selection bias in who takes the poll, beyond the bias already present in using an online platform like Prolific.

We collected California residents from two polls, both run on 20 October. One was open to all Americans, but we took a subsample that only included those who indicated their state of residence was California. We also ran a second survey on Prolific that was limited to California residents only.
National results from non-California residents were also used for fitting models, as described below. We had 1022 Californians and 3911 non-Californians after quality filtering, as described below.

Note that due to random sampling within the survey, not every respondent was asked every question.

We paid $1.47 for participants to complete the survey, which worked out to an average hourly rate of $9.80. This is normal for Prolific.

Quality Filtering

Online surveys do not always produce accurate information - sometimes participants could be deliberately dishonest or otherwise low quality to the extent where it is best to remove them when conducting with analysis.

We removed responses for being duplicates as determined by Prolific's internal ID system.

We removed respondents who, when asked “How honestly have you answered these questions?” at the very end of the survey, replied with “Not honestly at all” or “Somewhat honestly” instead of “Very honestly” or “Completely honestly” (see Robinson-Cimpian, 2014).

67 responses were removed because they failed an attention check - when asked “Which of these, if any, do you read, listen, or watch for news?”, they indicated that they watched a news program that did not exist (there was one such program, “The Current Show with Al Franken” on the list - the list contained 12 real programs). Note that this attention check was different from the proposition comprehension check.

We also removed respondents for failing a multiple low incidence check (see Lopez and Hillygus, 2018) which uses probability methods to screen for respondents dishonestly entering in unlikely information. This was done using the survey_dud_detector Python package developed by Peter Hurford at Rethink Priorities.

Results were also checked for straightlining using the survey_dud_detector Python package developed by Peter Hurford at Rethink Priorities, but this was not found to be an issue above and beyond the other quality checks and no respondents were removed for this issue.

After all of this quality filtering, there were 1022 qualifying California respondents.

Demographic Weighting
Surveys only capture a sample of the population, so we know that the result probably won’t exactly match the “true” result that we would get if we surveyed everyone in the population or that we would expect to see on election day.

The margin of sampling error describes how close we can reasonably expect a survey result to fall relative to the true population value. A margin of error of plus or minus 3 percentage points at the 95% confidence level means that if we fielded the same survey 100 times, we would expect the result to be within 3 percentage points of the true population value 95 of those times.

Without adjustment, surveys tend to overrepresent people who are easier to reach and underrepresent those types of people who are harder to reach. In order to make the results more representative we weight the data so that it matches the population – based on a number of demographic measures. Weighting is a crucial step for avoiding biased results, but it also has the effect of making the margin of error larger. Using US Census data, we can get a rough sense of the proportions of gender, race, and age we would expect to see in our sample.

We used the `surveyweights Python package` developed by Peter Hurford at Rethink Priorities to create weights to adjust our California sample to a California census-balanced electorate using race, age, gender, education, income, and 2016 Presidential vote.

For modeling purposes, described below, we further weighted national results to a US national representative sample based on race, age, gender, education, income, socioeconomic status, region, 2016 US national Presidential vote, and religious attitudes, and then used these national results to simulate California by re-weighing on California 2016 Presidential vote.

These weights were used to upsample and downsample responses accordingly to produce results that would end up matching California Census data. All data to form weights, and sourcing for that information, is contained within the publicly available source code for the package.

**Likely Voter Weighting**

To create a view of what will happen on election day, it is important to only sample those who vote. However, many people ineligible to vote and eligible voters who end up deciding not to vote still show up in our survey sample. To resolve this, we create a probabilistic likely voter model and weigh our results accordingly.

Our likely voter model is based on the Perry-Gallup index outlined in Pew 2016:

- Respondents were given 1 point for thinking about the election “Quite a lot”, 0.7 points for thinking about the election “Some”, and no points for thinking about the election “Only a little”.
- Respondents were given 1 point for saying they planned to vote.
Respondents were given 1 point for saying they were “Very likely” to vote, 0.7 points for saying they were “Likely” to vote, 0.4 points for saying they were “Neither likely nor unlikely” to vote, 0.1 points for saying they were “Somewhat unlikely” to vote, and 0.05 points for saying they were “Unlikely” to vote.

Respondents were given 1 point for either saying they voted in 2016 or for not being old enough to vote in 2016.

Respondents were given 1 point for saying they either plan to vote in person or that they have already received a mail-in ballot. If they requested but have not received their mail-in ballot, they were given 0.8 points. If they said they planned to vote by mail but have not yet requested their mail-in ballot, they were given 0.4 points.

This produces a scale from 0.05 to 5.

If a respondent indicates they were already voted, they were given a score of 5 instead of whatever score is calculated from above.

If a respondent indicated they were not registered to vote, they were given a score of 0 instead of whatever score is calculated from above.

Scores were mapped to probabilities of voting by transforming the decimal score to a whole number score from 0-7 by multiplying by 2.86 and rounding to the nearest whole number. These scores were then mapped 0 -> 0.11, 1 -> 0.13, 2 -> 0.23, 3 -> 0.34, 4 -> 0.4, 5 -> 0.59, 6 -> 0.63, 7 -> 0.83.

Probabilities were then converted to likely voter weights by normalizing all the probabilities to sum to 1 across the dataset.

These likely voter weights were then combined with demographic weights to adjust the sample to a likely voter electorate.

Electoral Modeling

We used the weighted data to further produce models to predict the estimated outcome on election day and the likelihood of a proposition passing.

Acquiescence Bias Adjustment

One issue with polling, especially for ballot initiatives that users have not thought much about, is acquiescence bias. Acquiescence bias is the tendency of respondents to disproportionately select “agree” / “yes” / “support” when presented with agree-disagree questions, regardless of their content (Jackson, 1959; Billiet & McClendon, 2000; Welkenhuysen-Gybels, Billiet, & Cambre, 2003).

Acquiescence can introduce errors into data, as survey responses to acquiescence-prone measures conflate individuals’ true attitudes and behaviors with agreeableness. This is especially an issue as multiple studies suggest that between 10% and 20% of respondents engage in this behavior (Schuman & Presser, 1981; Pasek & Krosnick, 2009; Saris et al., 2010).
which could dominate support for certain propositions that already have a large number of participants who remain undecided.

Furthermore, survey fatigue from looking at so many propositions could invite users to speed through the survey and initiate more support than they would have if they were thinking more thoroughly (Zhang & Conrad, 2014).

In our poll, we tested this by including a comprehension check. For all respondents, about halfway through, we tested a hypothetical ludicrous “100% income tax” in the same style as all of the other initiatives we polled (see Appendix 1 for wording). We found that 13.9% of likely CA voters supported this initiative (70.5% opposed and 15.6% didn’t know). Based on this, we assume that ~75% of these voters are actually undecided voters, and our models therefore account for a 5% uniform decrease in support (0.75*0.139*0.5) across all propositions due to this phenomenon.

National Polling Adjustment

Because our California state poll was smaller than our national poll and is harder to weigh to be representative due to less California census data about socioeconomic status and religion, we decided to supplement by weighing a national poll to be nationally representative of US (see description of “Demographic Weighting” above) and then further weighing on California 2016 Presidential vote to make this nationally representative sample match that of California. We compared how the likely voters on this adjusted national sample compared to the California state sample and used the results to adjust the margin of the California state sample and narrow the NMCIs.

Naive Modeled Confidence Intervals

After the figures were weighted for demographics and likely voting, and further adjusted for acquiescence bias and national polling, we constructed 80% naive modeled confidence intervals (NMCIs). NMCIs are intended to use polling results to predict actual election results using data from the poll alone and historical information about polling accuracy, but not other polls or other non-polling information like fundamentals. NMCI are not just the CIs implied by the raw polling margin of error. An 80% NMCI from $x$ to $y$ is meant to imply that there is an 80% chance that the true value as observed on election day will fall between $x$ and $y$.

80% NMCIs for propositions were constructed by looking at the poll’s raw weighted margin of error as calculated on the weighted N after applying likely voter weights and adjusting for acquiescence bias.
We furthermore allocated undecideds evenly between support and opposition, with some uncertainty and margin of error, allowing for a 20% chance that up to 75% of undecideds break for one particular side.

The final NMCIs were constructed with an additional 8pts of margin to account for historical accuracy of ballot initiative polling within three weeks of the election as well as methodological uncertainty in how we apply weighting, integrate information from national polling, and handle acquiescence bias.

Estimated Likelihood of Passing

An estimation of the likelihood of the ballot measure passing could be extrapolated by assuming a normal distribution across the 80% NMCI. 10 million Monte Carlo simulations of this normal distribution were then drawn and checked to see how many of them resulted in >50% support. That percentage is the modeled estimated likelihood of passing.

Appendix 1: Questions

Note that questions were presented to respondents in a random order and not all questions were presented to every respondent.

CA Prop 14

Suppose the following measure was on the ballot in your state. The proposed measure would issue a $5.5 billion general obligation bond for the state's stem cell research institute and make changes to the institute's governance structure and programs.

Supporters of the initiative argue that such a bond could lead to research that might produce breakthroughs in the quality of life of everyday Americans.

Opponents of the initiative argue that such money is ultimately wasted on ineffective treatments.

If the election were held today, would you vote for or against this ballot measure?

- Vote for / Support
- Vote against / Oppose
- Don't know / Undecided
CA Prop 15

Suppose the following measure was on the ballot in your state. The proposed measure would amend the state constitution to require commercial and industrial properties, except those zoned as commercial agriculture, to be taxed based on their market value, rather than their purchase price.

Supporters of the initiative argue that this measure would require large companies to pay their fair share of taxes.

Opponents of the initiative argue such a measure would hurt the economy by increasing tax burdens on small businesses.

If the election were held today, would you vote for or against this ballot measure?
- Vote for / Support
- Vote against / Oppose
- Don’t know / Undecided

CA Prop 16

Suppose the following measure was on the ballot in your state. The proposed measure would:
- Permit government decision-making policies to consider race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin to address diversity.
- Does not alter other state and federal laws guaranteeing equal protection and prohibiting unlawful discrimination.

Supporters of the initiative argue that including race in decision making is essential to ensure that all races are treated fairly.

Opponents of the initiative argue that truly fair decisions are race-blind and including race would only lead to unfair discrimination.

If the election were held today, would you vote for or against this ballot measure?
- Vote for / Support
- Vote against / Oppose
- Don’t know / Undecided

CA Prop 17
Suppose the following measure was on the ballot in your state. The proposed measure would amend the state constitution to allow people on parole for felony convictions to vote.

Supporters of the initiative argue that felons who have completed their sentences have already paid their debt to society and should be eligible to vote.

Opponents of the initiative argue that by committing a felony one has given up one's right to participate in the democratic process, and we should not be supporting their right to vote.

If the election were held today, would you vote for or against this ballot measure?
- Vote for / Support
- Vote against / Oppose
- Don’t know / Undecided

CA Prop 18

Suppose the following measure was on the ballot in your state. The proposed measure would amend the state constitution to allow 17-year-olds who will be 18 at the time of the next general election to vote in primary elections and special elections.

Supporters of the initiative argue that such a measure would expand access to democracy to people who will be old enough to vote at the actual time of the election.

Opponents of the initiative argue that such a measure would be expanding voting access to people who are technically still children.

If the election were held today, would you vote for or against this ballot measure?
- Vote for / Support
- Vote against / Oppose
- Don’t know / Undecided

CA Prop 20

Suppose the following measure was on the ballot in your state. The proposed measure would:

- Limit access to parole programs established for non-violent offenders who have completed the full term of their primary offense by eliminating eligibility for certain offenses.
- Change standards and requirements governing parole decisions under this program.
- Authorize felony charges for specified theft crimes currently chargeable only as misdemeanors, including some theft crimes where the value is between $250 and $950.
• Require persons convicted of specified misdemeanors to submit to collection of DNA samples for state database.

Supporters of the initiative argue that such a measure would ensure that allegedly “non-violent” but serious crimes, like rape, are adequately punished and not subject to parole.

Opponents of the initiative argue that such a measure would overburden our prison system and potentially limit access to parole for criminals who have served their time.

If the election were held today, would you vote for or against this ballot measure?
  • Vote for / Support
  • Vote against / Oppose
  • Don’t know / Undecided

CA Prop 21

Suppose the following measure was on the ballot in your state. The proposed measure would:

• Amend state law to allow local governments to establish rent control on residential properties over 15 years old.
• Allow local limits on annual rent increases to differ from current statewide limit.
• Allow rent increases in rent-controlled properties of up to 15 percent over three years at start of new tenancy (above any increase allowed by local ordinance).
• Exempt individuals who own no more than two homes from new rent-control policies.
• Prohibit rent control from violating landlords’ right to fair financial return

Supporters of the initiative argue that such a measure would help reduce eviction and allow people to afford to live in their own homes.

Opponents of the initiative argue that such a measure would hurt the economy and prevent the money needed to ensure the development of affordable housing.

If the election were held today, would you vote for or against this ballot measure?
  • Vote for / Support
  • Vote against / Oppose
  • Don’t know / Undecided

CA Prop 22

Suppose the following measure was on the ballot in your state. The proposed measure would define app-based transportation (rideshare) and delivery drivers as independent contractors and adopt labor and wage policies specific to app-based drivers and companies.
Supporters of the initiative argue that this measure would protect rideshare drivers and ensure easy access to affordable ridesharing, hurting consumers and the economy.

Opponents of the initiative argue such a measure would just boost technology company profits and harm rideshare drivers by denying them access to important benefits such as paid time off.

If the election were held today, would you vote for or against this ballot measure?
- Vote for / Support
- Vote against / Oppose
- Don’t know / Undecided

CA Prop 23

Suppose the following measure was on the ballot in your state. The proposed measure would:
- Require at least one licensed physician on site during treatment at outpatient kidney dialysis clinics
- Authorize the state Department of Public Health to exempt clinics from this requirement if there is a shortage of qualified licensed physicians and the clinic has at least one nurse practitioner or physician assistant on site
- Require clinics to report dialysis-related infection data to state and federal governments.
- Prohibit clinics from closing or reducing services without state approval
- Prohibit clinics from refusing to treat patients based on the source of payment for care

Supporters of the initiative argue that such a measure would help protect the health of people on dialysis by guaranteeing them access for a licensed physician and increasing monitoring.

Opponents of the initiative argue that such a measure puts a dangerous and costly burden on dialysis clinics, potentially risking the lives of thousands of people who need dialysis by blocking them from accessing care.

If the election were held today, would you vote for or against this ballot measure?
- Vote for / Support
- Vote against / Oppose
- Don’t know / Undecided

CA Prop 25

Suppose the following measure was on the ballot in your state. The proposed measure would:
Replace the money bail system (for obtaining release from jail before trial) with a system based on a determination of public safety and flight risk
Limit detention of a person in jail before trial for most misdemeanors

Supporters of the initiative argue that such a measure would help the thousands of innocent people each year who have to spend a year or more waiting for trial because they can’t afford bail.

Opponents of the initiative argue that such a measure would involve racially-biased computer algorithms deciding who gets stuck in jail and who goes free, which is unfair.

If the election were held today, would you vote for or against this ballot measure?
- Vote for / Support
- Vote against / Oppose
- Don’t know / Undecided

Comprehension Check

Suppose the following measure was on the ballot in your state. The proposed measure would abolish the sales tax but tax all income at 100%, such that any money earned would be taxed by the state.

Supporters of the initiative argue that such a measure would help alleviate important budget shortfalls and provide much needed funding to education.

Opponents of the initiative argue that such a tax is ludicrous, would completely destroy the economy, and impoverish every citizen as effectively no one could earn money.

If the election were held today, would you vote for or against this ballot measure?
- Vote for / Support
- Vote against / Oppose
- Don’t know / Undecided

Appendix 2: Code

Rethink Priorities values transparency and invites scrutiny of its methods. The code and data for all our data quality filtering, demographic weighting, likely voter weighting, and electoral modeling is available publicly on GitHub under an MIT license.