Boycott the Statewide Partisan Races to Protest Prop 14’s Effects

The June primary has come and gone with the prediction of record turnout. Because of Prop 14 (the Top-Two Primary), no candidates of the small parties will be on the ballot for state-wide office in the November general election, nor for any local partisan office within Alameda County. So much for the lies of the Prop 14 proponents about increased choices. Prop 14 even took away the possibility of the write-in option, so the sham democracy that now exists should be obvious to anyone. Meanwhile, the lawsuit against Prop 14 (Rubin v. Bowen) is slowly winding its way through the courts to an unpredictable conclusion.

Given this shameful situation, we thought much about what our position should be regarding the partisan races for the November election. We recommend that people BOYCOTT the statewide partisan contests in the November election. (Specifically, the following 7 statewide offices: Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, and Insurance Commissioner.) And also most of the other partisan offices: U.S. Congress, State Senate, State Assembly (unless you decide to vote in the District 15 contest - see writeup), and State Board of Equalization. Please also note that specific information about the candidates running in these races was provided in our June primary Voter Guide, which is available on the internet, at: http://acgreens.wordpress.com/voter-guides/.

Boycotting the statewide partisan races is not much of a sacrifice, since only candidates of the two major wings of the money party will be on the ballot. We hope that a visible drop in the vote totals in these races will make a statement against Prop 14. In addition, California, as the Green Party has done for many years, also needs to start looking at proven alternatives to the failing electoral system we currently have. For example, most of western Europe uses the "proportional representation" election system with great success, and with high voter turnout that often exceeds 80 percent. (For more details, please see: http://www.fairvote.org/reformsfair-representation/) We do want to be absolutely clear that we are NOT asking people not to vote at all. There are important ballot measures and worthwhile local non-partisan candidates that are worth supporting. So please DO VOTE— but with the exception of the above-listed partisan races!

Oakland Measure FF

Yes, Yes, Yes! Minimum Wage Increase

We enthusiastically support measure FF, which will raise the minimum wage in Oakland to $12.25 per hour, beginning March 2, 2015. This measure also indexes the minimum wage to inflation so that it will not lose purchasing power. Tens of thousands of low-wage workers will benefit. In addition to the wage increase, Measure FF will provide five to nine days of paid sick leave per year, depending on whether the business is large or small. Sick leave can be used for the worker’s illness or for care of a family member who needs care. Fewer people will have to go to work when sick, worsening their own health and that of other people.

Who could possibly oppose this measure? No official ballot argument opposed to this measure was submitted.

We understand that $12.25 is not a living wage in Oakland. Some people who are “fighting for $15” per hour are concerned that Measure FF will undercut that struggle. We don’t agree. A victory will not make Measure FF more palatable. It will move the struggle for $15 per hour forward. We support the struggle for $15 per hour regardless of whether Measure FF wins or loses. Please vote YES for measure FF.

Berkeley Measure R - YES Green Downtown and Public Commons Initiative

The Green Downtown Initiative is the latest chapter in the land use battle between big developers and the rest of us. In 2010, Berkeley voters approved a different Measure R, which asked voters to adopt a “Green Vision” for the downtown, ostensibly to meet the City's climate change goals. The measure said little and promised voters that in exchange for a few tall buildings, Berkeley would become one of the greenest cities in the United States. We called it greenwashing, and we were right. The City Council left huge loopholes in the 2010 zoning that allow projects to go forward with a bare minimum of the community, labor and environmental benefits promised. It also established an alternative, elective permitting process called “the Green Pathway” which allows any development under 750ft to go forward by right - no hearings, no public input, no appeals. That alternative process also trunctates the Landmarks Preservation review process in force city-wide, making it easier for projects that potentially endanger historic resources to be approved (with no public input, hearings or possible appeals).

Achesson Commons was the first of the big projects to receive approval under the 2010 zoning. With more than 200 units and rents estimated at $3400 a month, it eats up an entire block of downtown at University and Shattuck and provides only 9 affordable units, the bare minimum required of all projects in Berkeley. Not one extra unit of Affordable Housing, and not one other community benefit.

Please vote YES for measure FF.

Alameda Mayor Trish Spencer

It’s time to elect a new mayor. This spring more that 6,000 Alamedans signed a petition opposing the sale of Crab Cove to a developer when it was understood that this piece of land was to be purchased and developed by East Bay Regional Parks. The mayor and council went along with this bad plan and that’s what mobilized the community to engage in a petition campaign and do for the city what the mayor and city council didn’t. Two years ago we had a similar problem with a local developer who tried to swap a public golf course for a new development on land with dozens of objections to this by Mayor Gilmore. Mrs. Spencer objected to this and joined the campaign to save this parkland which triumphed in the end.

Luckily we have a mayoral contender who is currently on the school board ready to run and do the job. She’s demonstrated her critical thinking skills by objecting to a massive multimillion dollar school plan that is destined to fail and was often the lone vote when it came to passing out dollars for the now gone away superintendent.

STATE PROPOSITIONS

Proposition 10: Water Bond

“Water Bond: Funding for Water Quality, Supply, Treatment, and Storage Projects,” the last-minute Proposition 1, is a smaller version of “The Safe, Clean, and Reliable Drinking Water Supply Act of 2010.” In this case smaller is better. However, we still oppose this measure.

As Kathryn Phillips, Director of Sierra Club California, said in a Sacramento Bee article on August 19, 2014, “The new ballot measure, like the one it replaced, is filled with unpalatable extraneously expensive dams that will provide negligible benefit to the public, won’t resolve our water supply problems and will irrevocably damage the environment. It was written this way because the Legislature’s Republicans and San Joaquin Valley Democrats threatened to withhold votes needed to get the bond bill passed unless they got their dams.”

When the old larger water bond passed the Legislature on November 4, 2009, and then-Governor Schwarzenegger signed it a few days later, it was considered an “urgency statute” which would take effect immediately if the voters passed it in November 2010. It was not as urgent as its supporters pretended. That Water Bond was removed from the 2010 ballot because the economic downturn made it likely to lose. The same Water Bond was pulled from the November 2012 ballot because Governor Brown’s priority was to pass a tax increase, and voters were completely likely to pass both. Voters have gradually come to understand that bond issues, which may pass during boom times, burden the state with interest payments in difficult economic periods. And the current proposal to issue $7.1 billion in water bonds will cost about double that amount in repayments, to be paid out of general tax revenues.

Although “Storage Projects” is the last part of the title, it making sound trivial, that is misleading. “Dams and groundwater storage” is the largest part of the proposed expenditure, at $2.7 billion of the $7.1 billion proposal. Readers of “ Cadillac Desert: the American West and its Disappearing Water,” by Marc Reissner, published in 1986, will understand that any water projects being considered in the west have a long history. But a little history is helpful.

The last-minute decision to place this measure on the November ballot.

EBMUD, Ward 3

Marguerite Young

For the first time in many years, Ward Three of East Bay MUD has a contested election this fall. The election pits incumbent Katy Foukles of Piedmont, running for her sixth term on the EBMUD Board, against Marguerite Young, an Oakland resident with a background in environmental and labor organizing.

Both candidates assert that they want to make East Bay MUD a “green” environmentally friendly agency. She notes points to EBMUD’s record of water conservation and water recycling. Ms. Young argues that EBMUD could be doing much more, and that in this time of extreme drought, EBMUD has dropped the ball on stimulating the urgency of making water conservation a top priority.

A big part of the dispute between the two is on water rates and conservation. Ms. Young wants EBMUD to set up a drought rate structure that would send a strong “price signal” encouraging conservation by charging much higher rates for those who overuse water. Ms. Foukles argues that Prop. 218 has tied the District’s hands on changing the EBMUD rate structure so that it has only been on the board for twenty years, which is more than enough to have addressed drought rates before now. (It’s not as if drought is an unexpected event for California residents.)
The Green Party of Alameda County

**Our endorsement process**
For many of the candidates’ races, we created questionnaires for the candidates and solicited their responses. For others we conducted over-the-phone or in-person interviews and also gathered information from Greens and others working on issues in their communities and from the public record. For local measures we gathered information as comprehensively as possible. The Green Party of Alameda County held endorsement meetings to consider all the information and make decisions. Our endorsements are as follows:

When we list “No endorsement,” either we had unresolved differences that prevented us from agreeing on a position, or no position was warranted.

We also recommend bond measures for essential public projects that are unlikely to be funded otherwise. Our endorsement “Yes, with standard bond reservations” reflects our position that funding through bonds is more costly and therefore less fiscally responsible than a tax.

Where no recommendation appears, we did not evaluate the race or measure due to a lack of volunteers. Working on the Voter Guide is fun! Give us a call now to get signed up to help on the next edition!

**Taxes, Bonds, Fiscal Responsibility and the Green Party**
The Green Party’s commitment to being fiscally responsible is as important as our commitment to being environmentally and socially responsible. Given these values, we often endorse bonds and taxes with reservations. Why? Because structural inequities in the tax system make responsible and progressive financing impossible.

Our budget problems took a turn for the worse in 1978 when California’s most famous proposition, Prop 13, was approved by voters. Fourteen years later, in 1992, the Green Party achieved ballot status in California and we’ve been fighting for a fairer tax system ever since.

Voters overwhelmingly approved Prop 13 to keep people, especially seniors on fixed incomes, from losing their homes due to escalating property taxes. Other less-understood parts of Prop 13, however, have increasingly damaged California’s legacy of public schools, parks, highways, health care and quality of life.

Prop 13 flattened property taxes and prohibited imposition of any new “ad valorem” (according to value) taxes on real property. Prop 13 also took away the legislature’s ability to increase state taxes. This super-majority is a steep hurdle to jump, especially when slightly more than 1/3 of our legislators have pledged to vote against any and all taxes.

**Your Green Party Contributions**
We would like to thank the campaigns, businesses, and individuals who, through contributions to produce this voter guide, helped us write it. For the candidates and campaigns, please be assured that we conducted our endorsement process first. No candidates or campaigns were invited to contribute to the funding of this publication if they had not already been endorsed. At no time was there a discussion of the likelihood of campaign support during the endorsement process.

The Green Party Council voted not to accept contributions from for-profit corporations. If you have questions about our funding process, call us at (510) 444-2293.

**Enjoy politics? Missed a race?**
If you’re interested in political analysis or campaigning, we could use your help. Or if you are wondering why we didn’t mention some of the local races, it may be because we have not had any local Greens running. Are you ready to start organizing your own local Green Party chapter or affinity group? Contact the Alameda Green Party for assistance. We want to cultivate the party from the grassroots up.

**Some races aren’t on the ballot**
Due to the peculiarities of the law, for some races, when candidate(s) run for office(s) without opposition they do not appear on the ballot—but in other races they do. We decided to provide write-ins for most of the races that won’t appear on your ballot. Where we have mentioned those races or candidates you will find them on our blog web site (www.agreens.wordpress.com). Please check it out.

Our online Voter Guide You can also read our Voter Guide online at www.agreens.wordpress.com/voter-guides

---

**The “GPC” is one of the few County Councils that produce a Voter Guide for each election. We mail about 7,000 to Green households, and distribute another 10,000 through cafes, BART stations, libraries and other locations. Please read yours and pass it along to other interested voters. Feel free to copy the back “Voter Card” to distribute as well.**

**Your Green Party**
The things you value do not “just happen” by themselves—make a commitment to support the Green Party. Call us to volunteer your time during this election season and beyond. Clip out the enclosed coupon to send in your donation today.

During these difficult times, individuals who share Green values need to stand firm in our principles and join together to work to make our vision of the future a reality.

The Green Party of Alameda County is coordinating, tabling, precinct walking, phone banking, and other volunteer activities. The Green Party County Council meets in the evening on the 2nd Sunday each month at 6:45pm. This is the regular “business” meeting of the Alameda Green Party. We have several committees working on outreach, campaigns, and local organizing. Please stay in touch by phone or email if you want to get more involved.

**The Green Party of Alameda County is coordinating, tabling, precinct walking, phone banking, and other volunteer activities.**

The Green Party of Alameda County is coordinating, tabling, precinct walking, phone banking, and other volunteer activities. The Green Party County Council meets in the evening on the 2nd Sunday each month at 6:45pm. This is the regular “business” meeting of the Alameda Green Party. We have several committees working on outreach, campaigns, and local organizing. Please stay in touch by phone or email if you want to get more involved.

**Ways to reach us:**
County Council:
Phone: (510) 644-2293
Website: www.agreens.wordpress.com
Email: GreenPartyofAlamedaCounty@yahoogroups.com
(paid ads, no words, space, but a dish between County Council)
To get occasional announcements about current Green Party of Alameda County activities send an email to: announcementsGPC@yahoogroups.com.

---

**Local Green Party endorsements**
**Albany and Berkeley Greens**: We are working on a number of November candidate and ballot measure contacts. To join our email list, and for more information, contact: http://lists.risup.net/www/info/berkeleygreens/ (510) 644-2293

**Oakland-Emeryville-Piedmont Green Party**: We are running at least two candidates in the November election. Please join us as soon as you can possibly. For additional info, please see our website, YahooGroups, or telephone us at: www.OaklandGreens.org; http://groups.yahoo.com/group/oaklandgreens. (510) 436-3722

**East and South County Greens**: We are looking for east and south Alameda County Greens interested in helping re-activate an East County and a South County local. If interested, please contact Maxine Daniel (510) 459-7610, maxine.daniel@gmail.com.

**Creditors**: Our voter guide team includes: Peter Allen, David Arkin, Jan Arnold, Bill Baldwinster, Dave Burton, (page layout), Harry Chomsky, Maxine Daniel, Brian Donohue, Chris Frey, Jim Harris, Dave Heller, Barry Hermannson, Greg Jan, Torger Johnson, Ralph Kana, Tina Kimmell, Gretchen Lipow, Don Maclay, Bob Marsh, Patty Marsh, Kevin Reilly, Wilson Riles, Michael Rubin, Anthony Sanchez, John Seawright, Chuck Segal, Maxine Stephens, Joe Smith, Lindsay Vurek, and Nan Willsner.

---

**Support your Green Party**
The Green Party cannot exist without your help. Unlike some political parties, we do not receive funding from giant, multinational polluting corporations. Instead we rely on donations from generous people just like you. In addition, our mailing and printing costs have significantly increased since our last Fall issue, for the November, 2012 election. Please send in the coupon to the left with your donation today!

Please clip the form to the left and mail it today to help your Green Party grow.
She was involved in the petition campaign to save Crab Cove. A more serious objective is to re-look at the back-taxation of the land; she is currently running for the seat of Alameda County Council member, Green Party of Alameda County. She was involved in the petition campaign to save Crab Cove. She has been a passionate advocate for education and has been involved in her children’s schools throughout as well as the PTA and PTA Council. We need a new voice in city hall that speaks for the community and not for the developers. Alameda is undergoing a rapid change in building and demographics as well as a serious budget deficits. Mrs. Spencer’s comprehensive bio shows a depth of thought while our sitting mayor didn’t even bother to respond to the Green Party questionnaire (see: http://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questions/). VOTE FOR TRISH SPENCER.

Alameda City Council

Frank Matarrese

Three candidates are running for two seats on the Alameda City Council. One stands: Frank Matarrese, whose letters and articles published in the local press argue for fewer housing units, more light industry and more open space. Matarrese served on the City Council for two terms in the past. When it comes to Alameda Point, he thinks the city should focus on commercial uses and establishing parklands and open space, a much more creative idea for this man-made military base presently under restoration. He articulates ideas that demonstrate his knowledge and experience with Alameda issues that will be useful in maneuvering Alameda through the coming period, especially in the area of funding and regional planning. Matarrese actively participated in the petition campaign to save Crab Cove, a much needed and well organized transportation needs and traffic congestion. He clearly recognizes the City’s financial problems and huge deferred maintenance needs. He promises that the city manager prepare a balanced budget, and come up with a plan that reduces borrowing and excludes one time revenues. When he was on Council, he brought to fruition a Fiscal Sustainability Committee to establish a

rational budgetary plan for the city.

Alameda School Board

Solana Henneberry & Gary Lym

Three candidates are running for two seats. It’s time for incumbent Mike McMahon, who favors the sponsor of Measure C, to step aside – it’s time for a fresh face to address the situation (which include filing as write-in candidates, see item # 2 below). If it were possible under the election code to delay the decision regarding cancelling the election and use the intervening time to make a vigorous effort to let Alamedans know about the shortage of candidates and potential cancellation of the election, we would advocate that, but we understand that the code requires that the decision be made by the 75th day prior to the election which is Thursday.

At a minimum, we ask that, if this circumstance ever recurs, the City make a genuine and extensive effort to thoroughly inform the public about such a vital situation affecting the body that forms the key democratic link between the government of Alameda and the people of Alameda.

2. Cancelling the election now will prevent individuals who wish to enlarge the candidate field by running as write-ins from exercising their right under the state Elections Code to declare their candidacies up to two weeks prior to the election (California Election Code Section 8065.). The issue here is not the merits of the current field of candidates but the democratic process that is intended to allow for others to step up and run if they choose, once they learn who the current candidates are. We know that the current candidates often do not win, the issue is one of principle: a write-in candidate has the right under the law to run and to make that decision up to 14 days prior to the election, and having additional candidates would force the current candidates to campaign or at least make their positions clear to the voters in order to distinguish themselves from the other candidates. The result would be a better opportunity for voters to make an informed choice among candidates.

City of Alameda

Alameda Mayor continued from page 1

Alameda Healthcare District

No Endorsement, please, questionnaires

Four candidates are running for three seats. Four candidates filled out our questionnaire, which can be viewed online at http://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questions/.

Alameda Measure I - No $179 Million School Bond

After suffering through several years with a distant, cold-hearted superintendent (who recently took an assignment in Southern California), Alameda is now faced with the $179 million bond measure she organized before she left the town. This bond should fail because it is so huge and does not carry an election. In addition to the astronomical amount, the bond measure lacks an implementation plan. What generated this bond in the first place was a Field Act (seismic standards) compliance issue with the county district office, but the figures dealing with building expenses came in around $30 million. The amount ballooned into a $179 million grab bag to satisfy every stakeholder and “guarantee” passage. Therefore, the only more rational, transitional approach to taking care of Alameda’s public school buildings. VOTE NO AND SEND IT BACK TO THE DRAWING BOARD!

City of Albany

Albany City Council: Election Cancellation Response

On August 21, 2014, the Albany City Council voted to cancel the November Council election and to appoint to the three open Council seats the three candidates who had filed papers to run in the November City Council election:

1. Perhaps most important is that almost no member of the voting public in Albany to whom we have spoken during the past three weeks were familiar with city issues or activities, was aware that the Council is considering cancelling the election and that as a result the three candidates who have applied would simply be appointed to office.

We believe that, when the nomination period was extended due to an insufficient number of candidates, the City should have given broad public notice of this fact, including press releases to all community newspapers and a prominent ad in a widely read local publications, flyers distributed around the city, and other means. The democratic process is best served when a range of candidates with a variety of visions for our city is invited to the political process. When candidates stand on the issues and make an informed choice.

On August 20, 2014, From: Albany Green Party Election Committee To: Albany City Council Re: Potential Cancellation of City Council Election Dear Mayor Wiley and City Council Members:

On behalf of the Albany Green Party Election Committee, we have the following concerns about the potential cancellation of the November 4, 2014, election:

1. Perhaps most important is that almost no member of the voting public in Albany to whom we have spoken during the past three weeks were familiar with city issues or activities, was aware that the Council is considering cancelling the election and that as a result the three candidates who have applied would simply be appointed to office.

We believe that, when the nomination period was extended due to an insufficient number of candidates, the City should have given broad public notice of this fact, including press releases to all community newspapers and a prominent ad in a widely read local publications, flyers distributed around the city, and other means. The democratic process is best served when a range of candidates with a variety of visions for our city is invited to the political process. When candidates stand on the issues and make an informed choice.

We were not aware of the proposal to cancel the election until a few days ago and had to make an effort to find the relevant information on the city website.

We do not believe the democratic process will be served if the election is cancelled before the voters have an opportunity to find out what the situation is and consider their options for addressing the situation (which include filing as write-in candidates, see item # 2 below). If it were possible under the election code to delay the decision regarding cancelling the election and use the intervening time to make a vigorous effort to let Alamedans know about the shortage of candidates and potential cancellation of the election, we would advocate that, but we understand that the code requires that the decision be made by the 75th day prior to the election which is Thursday.

At a minimum, we ask that, if this circumstance ever recurs, the City make a genuine and extensive effort to thoroughly inform the public about such a vital situation affecting the body that forms the key democratic link between the government of Albany and the people of Albany.

2. Cancelling the election now will prevent individuals who wish to enlarge the candidate field by running as write-ins from exercising their right under the state Elections Code to declare their candidacies up to two weeks prior to the election (California Election Code Section 8065.). The issue here is not the merits of the current field of candidates but the democratic process that is intended to allow for others to step up and run if they choose, once they learn who the current candidates are. We know that the current candidates often do not win, the issue is one of principle: a write-in candidate has the right under the law to run and to make that decision up to 14 days prior to the election, and having additional candidates would force the current candidates to campaign or at least make their positions clear to the voters in order to distinguish themselves from the other candidates. The result would be a better opportunity for voters to make an informed choice among candidates.

3. In the past, Albany has regularly held elections for unopposed seats for offices whose importance in setting City policy is less significant than Council seats. These include the City Auditor, City Attorney, and City Clerk (in 2002, 2006 and 2010) and the unopposed City Treasurer elections in 2000, 2004, 2008, and 2012. This historic pattern would reasonably lead voters to expect that several Council candidates would also appear on the ballot. A change in this practice should have been announced in a manner that reached as many Albany voters as possible.

Albany Measure E - Multi-Unit Housing Board

On September 17, 2014, the Albany City Council voted to approve a new Multi-Unit Housing Board. This is a major step forward for those who support increased multi-unit housing in our city. This Board will work to ensure that new multi-unit housing developments are affordable and meet the needs of our community. We encourage all residents to get involved in this important process.

City of Albany

On September 17, 2014, the City Council of the City of Albany, California, approved an amendment to the City’s General Plan that will allow for increased multi-unit housing. This is a significant step forward for those who support increased multi-unit housing in our city. The new Multi-Unit Housing Board will work to ensure that new multi-unit housing developments are affordable and meet the needs of our community. We encourage all residents to get involved in this important process.
City of Albany

Albany School Board
Charlie Blanchard & Paul Black
Ross Stapleton-Gray, with reservations

Four candidates are running for three Board of Edu-
cation seats. The Green Party endorses candidate Charlie Blanchard on track record and philosophy that reflect
many of the Green Party 10 Key Values. His questionnaire
responses and his performance serving previously on the
Board of Education and currently on the city’s Sustainability
Committee demonstrate commitment to ecological wis-
dom, grassroots democracy, and collaborative, non-violent
problem solving. He supports sustainable, non-toxic build-
ning practices and exhibits a pragmatic understanding of
what is needed to move those goals. Those are incorporated
in any bid specifications for construction. He supports school
gardens and is open to the concept of a working organic
farm at the Gill Tract that would have a relationship with
the school district. He emphasizes supporting and empower-
ing teachers to develop instructional approaches that work
-- grassroots democracy within the school district. His
contributions to a series of publications on community and
social change demonstrates his dedication to future focus,
ecological wisdom, social justice, and non-violence.

Incumbent Paul Black aligns strongly with several Green
Party values, especially on school funding and achieving
the achievement gap for underperforming/minority students.
His focus on “authentic assessment...not standardized tests”
is perfectly in keeping with Green values of social justice and
respect for diversity. His questionnaire responses could have
been stronger on the topic of sustainability, and his position
on teachers’ health benefits did not express awareness of the
socioeconomic needs of school employees paying for their own
health care. At the same time, his experience on the board gives
him valuable knowledge about the economic difficulties facing
the district. For these reasons he has lacked the support of
his general support of incorporating gardens and a working farm
into the curriculum, as well as his support of pursu-
ing solar power options for the district, align with Green
Party values in other areas of the community, and we wish he had fleshed out his ideas in these areas. With
regard to serving the varied learning needs of students, he
is focused on “progressive education” but did not elaborate
under-performing, minority, or disadvantaged students.
He supports alternative instructional approaches “where
borne out by evidence” but did not elaborate on the types
of evidence he would find persuasive, so it’s not clear to
what degree he would support grassroots/decentralized
curriculum reform driven by teachers. He also supports
later school start times but noted that this could potentially
lead to working parents, suggesting some sensitivity to
the needs of a diverse population. In the absence of more
clarity about his views, we endorse him with reservations.

Elliott Ghinelli has decided to withdraw from the Green Party ques-
tionnaire. In the absence of information about his candidacy
other than his ballot statement, he receives no endorse-
ment.

Albany Measure LL
YES, with reservations
School Parcel Tax

The Green Party endorses Measure LL with reserva-
tions. The endorsement is because this measure funds
education, which is consonant with a future focus. The
reservation is because of the flat nature of this tax, rendered
ineffective to every parcel regardless of whether it is com-
mercial or residential, or its assessed or true value -- and
the trend toward personal local school funding in Albany
represented by Measure LL, which extends the “temporary”
weighting of property taxes for up to two-thirds of voters for
passage. Measure LL proposes a flat parcel tax of $275/year for
six years, equivalent to $23.17 per month, with an annual adjustment for inflation (~2 percent per
year). This represents an increase of $119/year above the
current $159 rate. The increase is to preserve the $1.3 mil-
lion/year revenue stream and to make up for lost revenue
due to a court ruling that now prohibits taxing commercial property differently than residential property.
The measure continues senior and low-income exemp-
tions for homeowners and a low-income rebate for renters. Measure LL adds a new exemption for parcels owned and
capitalized by persons receiving Supplemental Security
Income for a disability, regardless of age, or by persons
receiving Supplemental Security Income for a disability,
regardless of age, and whose yearly income does not exceed
250 percent of the 2012 federal poverty guidelines ($57,625
per year for a family of four). The added exemption for
those receiving SSDI adds one more element that makes it marginally more socially just. Although the city provides
information about the exemptions on the city website and
in the senior center newsletter, the website information is
difficult to access without someone to look, and the excep-
tions apply to a broader group than seniors. More publicity
is needed to ensure that the information is known by all those who may be eligible.
The Albany Greens recognize the continued impact of the
state’s budget on Albany schools, and replacing lost funding is consistent with the Green Party value of future focus.
Albany schools have been severely impacted as California
emerges from the recession. Albany is still ap-
proximately $4 million per year away from restoring previ-
ous levels. In 2013, California was ranked 49th in per-pupil
(funding when adjusted for cost of living, 55th otherwise),
providing 11 percent less than the national average.

At the same time, the Albany Greens remain concerned
that the current state system of funding schools, which
places ever-increasing pressure on local communities to
fund their own schools, is not socially just. Localities that
are able to do so tax themselves to increase funding for their
local schools, paying for those more education needs across the state. Relying on local school taxes such as Mea-

ure LL reduces the inequities of the state’s prior education
system, while leaving the current state school funding strategy,
which combines local property tax revenue with state fund-
in an attempt to roughly equal-per-pupil funding across the state.
To the extent that localities supplement state funding through local taxes, we return to a system of unequal funding in
which students in poor districts typically suffer once again.

The Greens note that the state and federal governments, which
have reduced funding for schools, are still in the process of
re-levying property tax bases. The Greens note that the state
Government has taken 30 years and the federal government
has taken generations. The Greens believe that the state
should return to- make significant contributions to

Berkeley Measures
City Council, School Board

Berkeley Measure D - YES
School Measure D is a straightforward general tax on the distribution of sugar sweetened
beverages and sweeteners used to sweeten those drinks. The current sales tax of 7.25% will
rise to 13.25%. The tax, the proceeds of which will go to a Pool to be distributed to local non-
profit health organizations. The measure also establishes a Sugar Sweetened Bever-
age Product Panel of Experts that will function like other City commissions. The Panel’s purpose is to make rec-
ommendations on how to use the revenue generated, and to what extent the City should fund programs
to further reduce the consumption of sugar sweetened
beverages, and to publish an annual report with those recommendations and the impact of this tax on the
health of the city residents.

The first piece of literature to hit mailboxes in op-
position to Measure D doesn’t tell you what it actually
does, and is vaguely threatening with “Exemptions, No
Accountability, We All Pay More.” But in tiny faint print in
the return address corner we can read that major funding to the tune of $300,000 is from the American Beverage As-
sociation California PAC. That’s not at all surprising. What is surprising is that Berkeley voters would buy into any of
it. This should be an easy Yes vote for everyone.

One of Big Soda’s arguments in opposition is lack of
accountability, something anti-tax advocates argue all the
time. The Berkeley City Council opted for a general tax,
since only a majority vote is required, and this means that
the City Council’s recommendation is all that is needed. They had
too chose to measure a special tax that will fund
only heath oriented programs directly as San Francisco has,
but a 2/3rds vote would be required. (Big Soda is opposing that measure too, of course.) Berkeley has
one even for the most popular program with no well-funded op-
position campaign, so we can’t just trust our City Council this
year? There are so many un- and underfunded health
initiatives in one city? The other argument that they have
Measure R
continued from page 1
provided, despite the promises made to voters of a variety of
enhanced environmental and community benefits, and
despite the 2010 up-zoning conferring a huge windfall for
the estate developers in the form of additional building
density. Yes, the historic street level facade is being saved,
but we are losing a host of long-term small businesses that are
doing just fine, including Ace Hardware, the kind of inde-
pendent merchant we need to sustain the local economy.

Even if Measure R 2014 promises developers to pay into a fund for loans to small businesses,
helping to tide them over in the face of this kind of business disruption, the promise is not worth
nothing.

The current Measure R 2014 makes good on the prom-
ises made to voters in 2010; namely that in exchange for
the increased height and other incentives developers have
obtained, they will in fact be required to provide meaningful
community benefits, including increased affordable hous-
ing, payment of prevailing wages to construction, main-
tenance and hotel workers, and incorporating a multitude of
“green” features into new buildings.

In the current Measure R, the maximum building heights are adjusted downward only slightly
and only in areas closest to existing residential neighborhoods, and

Measure R may look complicated. But it’s not. It does
just two things. First, it forces developers to build affordable
housing beyond the bare minimum, and ensures that labor,
community and environmental benefits will be delivered
along with taller and denser buildings. Second, it protects
our Public Commons from privatization – in perpetuity. No
Council majority – now or in the future – can change the
protections enacted by voters under Measure R.

Let’s keep the big picture in mind -- if we need to come
back in two years and fix a detail that’s OK. Right now, our
Downtown Plan is badly broken, and if we don’t pass these
changes now, it will simply be too late. Once the Post Office
is sold, and it’s on the block right now, we can’t get it back
for public purposes later. Later will be too late. Once all the
enormous new buildings in the pipeline have received their
permits, we can’t go back and get more affordable housing,
fair wages for workers, green building features and all of
the other benefits promised by developers. If Measure R is
the only benefit that we have our conventionally moo sable
People of Berkeley, City Council and Downtown we all
promised. Vote Yes on Measure R.
United v FEC, created those laws, giving corporations constitutional rights that were intended for We the People. Amending the Constitution is the only way to override the Supreme Court (SCOTUS).

Major political decisions affecting our daily lives: who gets elected, what laws are passed, energy and transportation choices and whether those contribute to climate change, healthcare options and whether air quality, water and food are healthy. They control our government and media.

The Constitution was written to protect humans, not corporations. Corporations are artificial entities like life spans and limited liability. Corporations don’t vote, get heart disease, or fall in love. They are heartless. Confining constitutional rights to people will not harm legitimate business activities. Governments can and do regulate corporate labor unions, etc. that can sign and enforce contracts, hold property, and be protected by the rights of their shareholders and members.

Corporate personhood was established long before Citizens United brought it into public awareness. A 28th amendment must end the fiction of corporate personhood in its entirety, and money being equated with free speech. Thus, Citizens United and other democracy-destroying SCOTUS opinions will be overturned.

Limiting campaign spending will increase free speech because the percentage that we are able to cut out of the pie of a few rich people’s money will be well worth the price. But corporate personhood’s destructiveness extends beyond money and politics. Corporations use personhood to avoid accounting and environmental and health and safety threats, to avoid disclosing product origins and prevent us from knowing what is in our food, to void ordinances that protect local businesses from, and to argue against access to services. Convince as many people as possible to vote “yes” on Prop A to instruct our representatives that corporate personhood must be abolished, free speech is only for humans, and Citizens United must be overturned. A 28th Amendment to the constitution (House Joint Resolution 29 introduced by Rep. Nolan) declaring that “corporations do not have constitutional rights, money is not free speech, and corporate personhood is crucial to transform this corporate controlled plutocracy into a democracy. This message cannot be stated often enough. Since Californians were deprived from voting for Prop 14, Berkeley residents will send a strong message by approving Measure P.

Berkeley Measure Q - YES Flex-time Initiative

Work time is an environmental issue as well as a social issue. We urge you to vote for this measure to help Berkeley’s working families and employees. One important measure to that is not discussed often enough. This advisory initiative calls on city, state, and federal governments to pass laws that make it easier for people to work flexible working arrangements, such as part-time work, telecommuting, and compressed work weeks. Under the proposed laws:

• Employees can request flexible working arrangements.
• Employers may reply to the request in writing and can refuse the request by providing a business reason. No ap­eals are allowed.
• Small businesses are exempted.

Similar laws were passed in Vermont and San Francisco in 2013. In June 2014, President Obama adopted this policy for federal employees. Such laws have been successful in Europe for over a decade. Existing laws emphasized the benefit to families. Our 40-hour workweek dates back to 1938, when families were expected to have stay-at-home mothers. Today, most American families have no stay­at-home caregivers. Most of these families are struggling and have trouble balancing work and family obligations. Today’s working families need more flexibility than father needs 75 years ago.

We are also emphasizing the benefit to the environment. People would have the option of living more simply, choos­ing to have more time instead of more stuff. Common sense tells us that, if people work fewer hours and consume less, they will also pollute less. Research confirms this fact.

The ecological benefits would be small initially but could be large in the long term. American work hours declined from 38 hours in 1940 to 32 hours in 1950 to 1840 to 40 hours per week in 1938, but they have not declined since. If we could get back on the track of gradually reducing average work hours, it would be much more feasible to build a sustainable economy during this critical transition period.

This initiative is endorsed by Bill McKibben, the na­tion’s leading climate activist, who writes, “A valuable initiative. Academic research demonstrates shorter work hours cut carbon.” For more information, see www.flexible­worktime.com.
father settled in District 1, who wants for all of Berkeley what he wants for his children: affordable housing, quality schools, public safety, and a vibrant, economically viable environment. He has an active field campaign with support from some of the most progressive leaders in the Bay Area. He has endorsed the progressive Rent Board slate (Maio, Wozniak, and Wenzgal), two local All-but-registered Greens who are working to bring the district with the more conservative fraternities and sorori- ties while carefully excising the progressive north campus coops and dorms that were part of District 7 for 12 years; the district lines look of obvious gerrymandering, extending a thin arm into the Willard neighborhood to keep Worth- ington in the district, as required by law. The Bates majority is depending on this majority of their UC Berkeley Slate of Action (frat party) allies to rally the students. Turns out they actually have no constituency: they weren’t even able to come up with a student candidate to run (the supposed justification for a student-supremacy majoritarian district), so the machine instead churned up one of their carefully culti- vated trainees, 27-year-old Sean Barry, apparently on the theory that he looks like a co-op candidate more than Worthington does (it’s worth reading Barry’s list of endorsers, a rogue’s gallery of Bates wardheifers and community wannabes). But Worthington, a former coop manager, has deep ties to the community and has the money to run a well-organized campaign to keep his seat.

Barack Obama’s Green Guide  is encourage (but not re- quired). Donations of any amount are encouraged (but not required).

Thanks everyone!

Berkeley School Board
Ty Alper, Josh Daniels and Karen Hemphill

Berkeley is fortunate to have four qualified and able candidates running for three seats in the November 14 2014 Berkeley School Board contest. Incumbents Josh Daniels and Karen Hemphill have been around and paid some dues. Appointed member Julie Sinai is known to many in Berkeley and was a City Council’s former Chief of Staff as well as a former Communications Director for U.C. Berkeley. Newcomer Ty Alper has garnered respect and endorsements wherever he has shown up, primarily because he exposes a move away from the High Stakes Testing mentality, appreciation of the teaching profession and the Teachers’ Union, a keen skepticism regarding Charter Schools and “Educational Reform” and a commitment to a vibrant Arts and Music program. The fifth candidate in the race, Norma Harrison, is passionate about education reform, but we cannot endorse her.

Josh Daniels is an attorney who works in Sacramento on bond measures and school district funding mechanisms throughout the state. He is smart, and although not entirely proficient in his Board member skin, has much to offer. We believe he will continue to grow in his Board member’s role.

Karen Hemphill has served two terms and is vying for her third. She is fluent with District Board politics. She has earned the Board’s trust, has earned the Board’s support, has an established constituency, and has been consistently “present” on student performance and safety issues.

Julie Sinai, though smart and politically savvy, is in our view too tied to the Bates/Hancock/Shmiter machine to merit consideration.

Ty Alper has shown that he is ready for a role on the Berkeley School Board. Since you can vote for three, cast your vote for him, and for Hemphill and Daniels.

Berkeley Rent Board
Katherine Harr, John Selawksy, Paola Laverde-Levine, James Chang, and Jesse Townley

We have five people, chosen by the July 13, 2014 Rent Board convention, running unopposed for five seats on the Berkeley Rent Stabilization Board. Two of the five candi- dates are registered and well known Greens: incumbent Jesse Townley and former three term School Board member John Selawksy. Both are solid progressives with proven track records with environmental and community issues. The other incumbent running for re-election is Katherine Harr, current Rent Board Vice-chair and a tireless advocate for tenants and tenants rights. The five-member team is rounded out by community organizer Paola Laverde-Levine and student leader James Chang.

This is a dynamic team with the potential to lead Berkeley into an era of increased seismic and disaster preparedness safety, habitability inspections, and housing stock protection for long-term tenants and families. Please give all five your enthusiastic and unequivocal vote. Contact them at berkeleyrentboard.org.

** STOP PAPERLESS **

The PDF version of this Voter Guide is available at http://ucgreens.wordpress.com/voter-guides/. Would you like to save some trees and printing/postage costs? PLEASE LET US KNOW AT agreeneruc@gmail.com that you prefer to receive email (with our Green Voter Guide) instead of the full Voter Guide online) instead of printed copies.

Printed copies (for your use, and to distribute) will be available at our Green Party headquarters at 2022 Blake Street, Berkeley, CA 94704; (510) 644- 2293. Donations of any amount are encouraged (but not required).

Thanks everyone!
Emeryville City Council
John Bauters and Scott Donahue
Dianne Martinez, with reservations

Four candidates are running for two Emeryville City Council seats. Ken Bukowski will live a political legacy in Emeryville. He served on the Council for 24 years, and he was an irreplaceable voice who was accessible by topic any time of the day. For this invaluable work he has been paid nothing. He has also organized small business owners so as to help them be aware of their rights and of actions being taken in their name. He has a good political understanding of the city and he has been a leader of the council. This has helped small businesses have an effective voice in City Hall. Bukowski comments on issues regarding transportation, taxes, city budgeting and infrastructure and he has added to that with another 12 years of depth. He is a pragmatist, who sees Bay Street as a successful project because it contributes 25% of the city’s sales taxes, rather than as a failure because it has big box stores and inadequate bike paths. Bukowski’s vote during his final term in office, to allow a zoning exception in order that a developer could build far higher than city law allowed, outraged the progressive community, but appeared pragmatically weighted to him. He favors a city minimum wage law, but exempting present businesses and enforcing by the state. Bukowski believes in listening to citizens, and organizing citizens to achieve goals such as his dream of free city wide wi fi. He states that the end of redevelopment should usher in a new opportunity for community voices to be heard. He objects and demands eliminated by the resignation of a mailer without informing affected parties. His depth of understanding of the political history of Emeryville over the past quarter century is unsurpassed. Whoever else is elected to city council would do well to seek Bukowski’s advice, and spend time absorbing his depth of knowledge regarding the workings of regional bodies as well as City Hall.

No other candidate could have preserved the Green Party quest with the depth and detail with which he answered. Bukowski answered it. No one could be more dedicated to the city. It is unfortunate that Bukowski’s unresolved legal issues, particularly a finding of a former campaign, preclude the possibility of his being endorsed by the Green Party for a seat on the council.

Dianne Martinez has lived in Emeryville for four years. During that time she and her two children, bought a house in town after having studied enough real estate law to represent herself as agent, and has done some freelance video production work with a locally based company. Most of her experience has been as an angel investor where she has worked as a producer on documentaries made round the world. Aside from having done some work for the Sierra Club earlier in life, she is a political experience of any kind. Her would be a steep learning curve, enabled by a supportive husband, having her children in day care, and not needing to hold any job other than City Council. Her experience and our questionnaire indicate that she would be an advocate for bicycle paths, pedestrian walkways, parks and open spaces. She has been meeting with Emeryville city councilors and members, local elected officials, and staff. She is someone who the job which she approaches with the zest and intelligence she has clearly brought to her former career and family life. She is running on a slate with Scott Donahue. They have received the endorsement of four Emeryville city councilors, the Sierra Club, and local activist group RULE.

As a Filipina, Martinez would like to represent an ethnic minority on the council, as well as a homeowner, and parent who expects to send her children to the Emeryville schools. Due to her lack of past political involvement in Emeryville or elsewhere, and her having had a career which would not in any way have prepared her for the responsibilities of a city council position, we can only endorse Dianne Martinez with RESERVATIONS, our endorsement based on her progressive values, her running on a slate with Scott Donahue, and her depth of experience.

Scott Donahue has lived in Emeryville for 37 years. He has served on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee for the past ten years. He is well known as a public advocate and community organizer, has provided several public sculptures, and having been part of the public arts scene for so many years. This is Donahue’s first run for City Council. He has experience as a consultant. Donahue has some knowledge of the issues he would need to understand as a councilor, and would of course be a strong advocate on issues of bicycle and pedestrian needs. He is more visionary than practical, and doesn’t always answer Bukowski’s least favorite development in Emeryville is Bay Street, which he dislikes for its lack of bicycle paths, big box stores, wage jobs and lack of Community Benefits Agreements with the city. Donahue would bring to the council his artistic vision, progressive values, and long time dedication to Emeryville. On many issues he will need advice and direction, and his answers to our questionnaire indicated a superficial understanding of issues affecting city finances. He is running on a slate with Dianne Martinez. They have the endorsement of four city councilors, Unite Here Local 2450 and the progressive activist group RULE. Due to his longstanding dedication and service to the city, including his committee participation, his progressive values, and endorsements, we think Scott Donahue deserves a chance to serve on the City Council.

J. Bauters has lived in Emeryville for two years. He is presently the Public Policy Director at Housing Caliifornia, a state and federal government lobbyist. He represents those agencies and efforts that are addressing needs for affordable home development, sustainable communities and solutions to homelessness at the state level. Although he hoped to be appointed to the housing committee in Emeryville, the opening for which he anticipated applying will not be coming up until December, and he has not yet had opportunity to serve the city. His decision to run for council was made toward the end of a challenging deadline, when he realized he was particularly qualified on the basis of his experience in communities other than Emeryville. Bauters is an attorney who for seven years represented low income people facing eviction from their homes and the housing projects in Chicago. He represented the homeless, and the undocumented. He is well versed in housing law, and his answers to our questionnaire indicated that he has a combination of the visionary and the pragmatic in approaching how to serve low income families and encourage families and small businesses to come to Emeryville. He favors a regional increase in the minimum wage. His views of traffic control are not limited to encouraging bicycles. Before becoming an attorney, Bauters worked as Disaster Relief Coordinator for the Red Cross. His questionnaire indicated an understanding of ways that safety needs of Emeryville will need to change as it expands, an issue not mentioned by other candidates. While living in a small community in northern Chicago, Bauters spearheaded the successful creation of a local dog park, including a dog wash and water fountain which we were impressed by the Chicago Bar Association to serve on the Judicial Evaluation Committee, where he interviewed lawyers and other civic leaders about candidates for judicial positions in Cook County. His investigations and review were the basis for recommendations put out by the Bar Association to voters about the qualifications of people seeking judicial positions. Our local election board has been endorsed by International Association of Fire Fighters, Alameda County Local 55 (IAFF) Ruth Atkin, Emeryville City Council Mem- ber, Vice-Mayor of Emeryville, Darrell Moore, Berkeley City Council Member, District 2. John Gooding, Long time Emeryville Resident, Shamus Roller, Executive Director at Housing California, Frank Mecca, Executive Director at the County Welfare Directors Association and San Francisco Bar. Bauters extensive knowledge of issues that affect our city and his progressive resume, though outside of Emeryville, would make him a strong addition to our city council. We endorse John Bauters for Emeryville City Council.

Emeryville School Board
Christian Patz

This year four School Board candidates are running for three seats. The three incumbents are John Affeldt, Miguel Dwin, and Christian Patz. A non-incumbent, Donn Merrim, is also running. We are only endorsing one candidate. We have been troubled for some time by the School Board at the tiny school district in Emeryville. A couple of years ago, more than 90% of the teachers retained by the district approached the Board with a resolution of ‘no confidence’ in the former Superintendent of Schools, asking for relief. The Board met their cry for help with a doubling down on the former Superintendent and the teachers were ignored.

Further, this Board ignored 73 parents and citizens who requested a forum to debate the Board’s plan to close two schools and merge it with the high school. These two lapses in judgment are disqualifying for a Green endorsement as far as we’re concerned and that means we will not endorse either of the incumbents who were involved, Miguel Dwin or John Affeldt.

Christian Patz on the other hand was only appointed to the Board this past June, so he has not partaken in any disqualifying behavior. In fact, we like Mr. Patz’s progressive views on supporting teachers and his insistence that schools teach all children: a rebuke of the right wing charter school privatization model. He currently works as a special education administrator at Mt. Diablo School District.

Donn Merrim’s work as an architect informs his views on education and he expresses much admiration for the new K-12 school complex being constructed at Emery despite prominent educators having said that it is crammed on too small of a site. We’re also concerned Mr. Merrim isn’t up to speed on pedagogy and we’d like to see a more student-centered supporting Board member, so we’re not able to endorse him.

Emeryville Measure K - Yes, with reservations

School Parcel Tax Renewal

Measure K would extend the existing school parcel tax of $0.15 per square foot on Emeryville real estate for 20 years, pretty standard fare. The Emery School District has been less than totally transparent with the existing but sun-setting parcel tax, playing fast and loose with the legally required oversight and we hope the culture will change with the passing of this extension. We therefore recommend a position of yes with reservations on Measure K.

Emeryville Measure U - YES

Becoming a Charter City

Emeryville Measure V - YES

Property Transfer Tax

Measures U and V are connected and would change the town’s governing system and impose a real estate transfer fee. Measure U changes Emeryville from the existing ‘general law’ governing structure that gives more power to Sacramento to a ‘charter city’ that provides for local, decentralized control. Charter cities, common in California, are called “home rule” cities because they give more power to the people in their respective towns. Measure U must pass for Measure V, the real estate transfer fee, to be valid. Measure V provides a fee for both residential, and more importantly, commercial real estate transfers. The lion’s share of these fees would be borne by the commercial sector but the proposed fee would still make Emeryville cheaper than the transfer fees of the charter city neighboring towns of Oakland and Berkeley. Measure V would provide much needed revenue for resident amenities such as parks, bike facilities, child care, youth programs and infrastructure such as sewer and storm drain maintenance. The Green Party recommends a strong yes on Measures U and V.
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Oakland Measure N - No Endorsement
School Parcel Tax

The new Measure N on the November ballot reflects a return of the parcel tax in 2008. It is a flat parcel tax of $10 a month ($120 annually) and would require a 2/3rds majority. It would have a 10 year life, with exemptions for seniors and low income Oaklanders.

It is a proposal passed by a teacher initiative in 2010, Measure L, which called for a $195 annual assessment, and failed by less than 1 percent, with opposition by anti-charter school advocates, including the teachers union (the Oakland Education Association).

The ballot arguments highlight the spending priority (90 percent) for going student programs to help prepare for college admission and reduce student dropout. There would be a commission, supposedly representative of the community and staff, to make policy decisions on expenditures.

While this language has appeal, there are a number of serious problems with this measure, over and beyond it being regressive, with no adjustment for size/value of property. Most serious is that by stating it will be allotted on a per capita student basis, it guarantees that money will go to Oakland charter schools. The city already has the highest percentage of students going to charters anywhere in California. This is not only a loss of revenue, but a major step toward an urban education system.

Secondly, for all the talk about community input, the School Board and District have been arbitrary so far in this campaign and have a history of manipulating with similar parcel funds. While this alone might not be sufficient to oppose N, when combined with other concerns, it should lead us to be very cautious. The Oakland Education Association just took a neutral position, though some activist members vary from open opposition to support for the measure. In 2010, the union also did not take a position (for much of the same reasoning as listed above). This year the outlook is considerably better.

Oakland Measure Z - NO Police & Services Parking & Parcel Tax

Measure Z is the renewal of Measure Y of 2004 as amended by measure BB in 2012. The Greens are opposed to Measure Z (formerly Y) because we support the goals of the measure. We are for community policing, restorative justice, violence prevention, and more.

We are also in favor of stable funding for police and fire.

What we have not seen after 10 years of Measure Y is steady, stable development of community policing and restorative justice programs. We have a history of inaction on the Oakland Police to decide if a case should go to prosecution or be diverted to restorative justice.

Nevertheless, building up our city’s ability to put community policing and restorative justice into practice, we have built up a system to farm most of it out to non-profits. Little development or training is retained in our departments and there has been little official reform.

What we have is mostly a system to award contracts in response to requests for proposals and for that we have inadequate oversight, especially of results. As the reformed outposts are not really city programs, the ongoing review needed for year to year improvement has nowhere to live. Funds were not always spent on what the measure promised and the budget is as we address.

Right now there is no emergency. The city is not in the budget dire straits of 2010 and 2012. Without Measure Z the city will be able to find another way to fund police, fire, and restorative justice. The measure that went towards social crime prevention.

There is time to put together a better plan, and if needed, bring it back to the voters as one or more request for dedicated funding.

Oakland Measure CC - YES, with reservations
Public Ethics Commission

City of Oakland Measure CC is a proposal to strengthen the Oakland Public Ethics Commission (PEC) thinned of the City Charter. The measure was drafted by City Council member Dan Kalb. Last year Kalb created a working group to advise him on the content of the proposed changes to the City Charter, but ultimately the proposal is Kalb’s. While overall the proposal is good, it is unfortunatly that Kalb did not include more opportunities for public participation in the crafting of the proposal. The working group was not able to help give the details of the proposal, and it is not clear members of the group had any meaningful impact on the proposal. Due to this lack of time spent in public and broad level discussion, it means some of the goals of the proposal may not achieve the desired goals of improving ethics in Oakland. Because this is a change to the City Charter, it will be difficult to make changes to the details of the proposal if it is found they are needed.

While having laws in the Charter makes it more difficult for the City Council to meddle, it also makes for a less flexible law that can only be changed by the voters. ten years, most recently if is that it sets the term of PEC members at three years. There are many arguments for making the term four years; it would greatly increase the institutional knowledge, and provide each of the elected officials with power to appoint PEC members with one appointment term in per position. Currently this limita- tion is contained in the Oakland Municipal Code, and it can be changed by the voters. If it is not a clear that a different term of office would be better, the City Council can make the change, but by placing this restriction in the City Charter, it will require the time and cost of an election to make the change.

Strengthening the PEC is long overdue, and this will accomplish the goal, but the devil is in the details. Let’s hope this proposal works and it achieves its goals.

Oakland Measure DD - NO Independent Redistricting Commission

This charter amendment would transfer the authority to draw district boundary lines, for the City Council and Oak- land Unified School District Board, from the City Council to a redistricting commission. Redistricting is done every year, from 2013 for the election happening now (November 2014).

We expect the idea of an independent commission would be a step backwards in the crucial areas of transpar- ency and accountability. As of November 2008, California voters passed a similar measure for State Assembly, State Senate, and State Board of Equalization districts. Can anyone tell the difference in outcome? Can anyone name a single member of the Commission? The anonymity is the enemy of transparency and accountability. If elected officials do the redistricting, and you don’t like the new map, you know whom to blame.

The Alameda County Central Labor Council voted to oppose this change. Their reasons were that the City Administrator would have a lot of power in the process of recruiting the applicants and choosing the Screening Panel of three people (with City Council approval). There has been a lack of outreach to stakeholder groups. This idea needs further study and broader input. Redistricting will not be done again until 2023, so there is no urgency to pass this complicated and controversial proposal. We agree, and ask you Vote to No on Measure DD.

Oakland Measure EE - YES
Oakland Municipal Retirement System Termination

Measure EE will terminate the Oakland Municipal Retirement System (OMERS) as of January 1, 1993. Since 1970, all new Oakland employees are paying intoCalPERS (California Public Employees Retirement System), and thus the only remaining participants in OMERS are currently 22 employees with an average age of 54.

The funds would be transferred, if there is a 4/5 vote by the City Council, into a group annuity with a top-rated insurance firm, and paid to the remaining OMERS recipi- ents. The City is ready to deal with a noted annuity firm in Philadelphia to facilitate this process.

Such a measure would seem rather obscure and even insignificant, if it were not for the fact that we live in an age of public employee pension programs. Kalb, Tadic, that said, this initiative appears generally positive, with the city agreeing to be the ultimate guarantor of benefits and with no seeming reduction for the recipients. Moreover, savings from this changeover would go into a special reserve fund to facilitate the process of transition; any potential problems will be more than covered by this fund. The more immedi- ate reason for the passage is that by leaving OMERS funds on the savings on OMERS administrative overhead, which is nearly equivalent to the payouts), and from the remaining funds, could be up to a $2.9 million return, depending on the needs of the city in the long run.

In truth, this seems to countere the current trend of denigrating public employee pensions; the ending of a government service isn’t a reason to meddle, but a reason to continue to provide a more transparent and accountable system. Nonetheless, we can use any discussion on this measure to raise broader concerns about the attacks on pensions, especially PERS and STRS (State Teachers Retirement System), and the rights of working people to a secure retirement. Thus, we advocate a YES vote.

Oakland Mayor
#1: Jason Anderson
(Saied Karamoosh ranked #2, Dan Siegel ranked #3)

The Oakland Mayor’s race is between 15 ballot can- didates, a write-in candidate and a dog with a website. Six candidates formed the new group run two members of Council, the City Auditor, a Port Commissioner and a former school board member are running against each other. The other well-funded candidate is a teacher and broadcast. All but one of the candidates except for one filled out our questionnaire; you can review their answers at: http:// aggrens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionsaries.

For #1 we recommend Jason Anderson and for #2 we recommend Saied Karamoosh—to send the message for a more democratic Oakland based in a people’s economy, social justice and environmental realism. These two grass roots stand out as both take the more progressive Green line in this election. They have put forward positions that are based on structural reform of our city. They treat an accurate democracy in a righteous way and they have stood up unafraid to call out racism, repression and exploitation when they see it. These two candidates come at politics as an act of social solidarity which Anderson expresses with his proposal of a “Town Mayor” who is part of the com- munity and not above it. Anderson, who we met as an active participant of Occupy, also brings to the table some new thinking on our relations with the police that bring the well-heeled of the members of a police reform and the power of the conversation along with the other more common concerns of police accountability, Karamoosh published a manifesto that focuses on issues of the police reform, participatory budgeting and prioritizing youth, but unfortunately he hasn’t been active in Oakland very long, we are only ranking (and not endorsing) him as our #2 choice. Nevertheless, his background and showing his willingness to stand up for people through his extensive volunteering. A vote for both of these candidates sends the right message.

Dan Siegel is our recommendation for the #3 ranked vote, with reservations. Siegel has a fantastic record as a civil rights and labor lawyer and a long and respectable history as a local radical progressive. His platform has put real social concerns from the minimum wage to restorative justice up front and he has personal credibility on all these issues. He has the skills to manage police reform and the history to implement community policing. The people who have worked with Siegel find him unique as a candidate. I’m proposing a leadership for Oakland progressives, but his supporters are. Even with that in mind, Oakland would be much better off and we as a people would likely move forward politically if Dan Siegel was to win.

Parker, Ruby, Schauf and Tuman hold similar views and make similar proposals. The focus of these four candidates is “public security first” and “get business growing” proposals, with a number leaning on the same need for the management of resources to equity and social justice which they seem to want to address in “round two” once the city has less crime
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Oakland Measure EE - YES
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continued on next page
more jobs. This we have all heard before and in practice, the round one is usually not as successful as promised and the round two usually does not benefit the residents who need it.

Parker distinguishes himself in that even if he has a business background, he does not see government running as a business. He said he is no expert on management but provides good service to the public, especially the public that needs it most. Ruby claims that there is much money to be saved by cleaning up waste in government, as one would expect the Auditor to say. Although he is a business man, Mayor’s job is his main job and will probably lose. Schaf is also giving up another term, for her on council, to make a long shot bid. Schaf is for more services, such as the city’s library, and promises to be a more informed, nuanced consideration. It is surprising that Ruby and Schaf both didn’t just stay where they were and support Tuman or Parker, or both. Schaf is a co-founder of a program that pushes for transparency in the city, when he launched his campaign way before Schaf, giving up his on her job to run. Tuman is especially strong on analysis and the im-
portance he places on city officials doing their jobs more professionally and is the closest on his support of higher staffing levels for the Oakland Police and his willingness to pay the price for it. Good folk all four, but we cannot recommend one for their entire slate.

Kaplan, Quinn and Siegel form another group. Labor has split most of their endorsements between the three. The three have known each other and worked together for years and for city council and most of their campaign captions is not a risk free bid as her at-large council seat is not up this year. She says she supports all the policies that a Green would back and is to be committed for taking public stands, but what does she do? Can she make a case in the council office? Her voting and advocacy record in office does not show an active engagement in support of her public stances. We can not endorse her because no one knows what a vote for Kaplan would mean.

Our very hard working Mayor Quinn’s record is for a reasonably well run administration that has made some slow progress on police staffing, budget alignment, development projects and many smaller things that do not get attention at election time. She is quick to point out that crime is down, but she and her policies are not responsible for the massive protests and continued crime. She has done well to recruit more diverse, multilingual police officers. What she claims as Operation Cease Fire, Community Policing and Restorative Justice success goes to show how important it is to be clear on what people mean by these popular terms and how we measure success. The numbers do not add up and Oakland still sends a large number of people to jail every working day, as we fail to send half the students to walk the stage for their diploma every year. We have lots of undersized, almost symbolic programs that show that “something” is being done and much of that something falls into a culture of doing little, too little, and not braking the cycle.

What happened around Occupied was a coordinated political crime committed in a series of US cities against political candidates supporting the movement. There was a true crime going on, and there was no need to send the riot squad out for what was at worst a illegal camping. People were out protesting the banks, the finance and the 1 percent. There was no emergency other than the few peace officers with tiled heads marching to turn every town against the targets to protest for. The teargas flew again.

Mayor Quinn calls her poor performance a set of mistakes, but she has never commented about her involvement in this crackdown and what that 20 mayor conference call was all about.

No progressive should vote for her.

The seven “also-ran” range from Nancy Sidebotham, who is a fairly reasonable, well informed critic of the local government, running for office in order to bring about improved financial mismanagement issues in the candidate forums, to Francisco Gómez, who was featured on the city’s web page. Their campaigns will not improve the economy by teaching young people the rules of capitalism via his own video game. Ballot candidates Houston, Liu, McCollough, Sidebotham, Williams, and Williams write candidate Sam Washington, an Oakland (unofficial) candidate Einstein, all have something to add to the conversation, but none inspire us Greens to recommend voting for him.

This candidate list shows again that Oakland needs more, unified sustained, progressive policies that advance civil rights, economic justice and social guarantees, via governance that truly represents the people. The race is just prepared to be faster running races. We need a broad based Oakland Progressive Alliance clear and free of Democratic Party back support. One of the seven accepting big donors. Please vote in this election and start thinking about who we should run in the next ones.

Oakland City Auditor
No Endorsement

The Oakland City Charter delineates the responsibilities of the Auditor and makes the position an important part of the checks and balances of city government. A strong auditor benefits all the residents of the city by bringing transparency and accountability to city activities. "You can’t talk to me if you are counting the city’s money," says Mayor Jean Quan, Deputy Mayor Sandrine Swanson, City Council member Pat Kernighan and Dan Kalb, to name a few. We have had a sad history of electing leaders to City Council with no real change in how Oakland is governed and we have no reason to expect Abel to make a difference.

Dana King polically declined to return our question-

nary. We are somewhat surprised that she wishes to run (such as “We need strong leaders who are willing to try new approaches”, unspecified, “instead of just following the same tired and unsuccessful policies”, unspecified). She promises to work with others “at least in the first year” and to review the City departments, budget and programs, but I cannot state that I am aware of a specific area or function that should be included in the annual or multi-year audit plan at this time.” We would expect a candidate for City Auditor to have enough knowledge of the city to know at least one thing that needs to be audited.

Abel Guillen currently serves as a Peralta Community College District Trustee (and is currently the President of the Board), and a Vice President of an East Bay school finance firm. Most of the Democratic Party establishment endorses him and he is a standard-issue Democratic Party liberal, endorsed by the Alameda County Labor Council, a prominent local political group.Mayor Jean Quan, Deputy Mayor Sandrine Swanson, City Council member Pat Kernighan and Dan Kalb, to name a few. We have had a sad history of electing leaders to City Council with no real change in how Oakland is governed and we have no reason to expect Abel to make a difference.
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Abel Guillen currently serves as a Peralta Community College District Trustee (and is currently the President of the Board), and a Vice President of an East Bay school finance firm. Most of the Democratic Party establishment endorses him and he is a standard-issue Democratic Party liberal, endorsed by the Alameda County Labor Council, a prominent local political group. Mayor Jean Quan, Deputy Mayor Sandrine Swanson, City Council member Pat Kernighan and Dan Kalb, to name a few. We have had a sad history of electing leaders to City Council with no real change in how Oakland is governed and we have no reason to expect Abel to make a difference.
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She seems serious about “moving the ball” for more than herself, but there is nothing radical here. She would expand community policing and restorative justice programs. But like others running for office in Oakland, she wants a police department with new officers, though she offers no rationale for that number and no explanation of how to pay for it. Another negative, Campbell Washington has worked with GO Public Schools, which advocates for charter schools, and as a School Board member she voted to approve new charter schools.

Paul Lim has no formal relationships with Oakland community organizations. He is running his campaign via www.facebook.com/paul.lim.9440/ for Facebook, supports solar panel systems, and he is trying to explain the details of his campaign.

Where: Niebyl-Proctor Library, 6501 Telegraph Ave., Oakland (between Alcatraz and 65th St.)
Wheelchair accessible.

**GO PAPERLESS**

The PDF version of this Voter Guide is available at http://acgreens.wordpress.com/voter-guides. Would you like to save some trees and printing/postage costs? PLEASE LET US KNOW if you prefer to receive email with your Green Voter Card plus a link to the full Voter Guide online instead of printed copies.

Printed copies (for your use, and to distribute) will always be available at our Green Party headquarters, 2022 Blake Street, Berkeley, CA 94704; (510) 644-2293. Donations of any amount are encouraged (but not required).

Thanks everyone!
County Superintendent
Don’t vote for Foster

In this past June’s election we took a ‘No Endorsement’ position in this race, which then had five candidates. The position is still of significant importance, dealing with a budget of $45 million and regulating 18 school districts within our county. The current County Superintendent role is now of more importance with enhanced fiscal powers under the new Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) for schools and its governance structure, LCAP (Local Control and Accountability Plan).

The selection is now down to two candidates: Karen Monroe and Helen Foster. We still have deep reservations about the two, being the hand-picked candidates of outgoing Superintendent Sheila Jordan and clearly a representative of the Democratic Party mainstream. She is a fiscal con-

servative and has not shown strong opposition to charter schools and school choice. During her tenure she showed no demonstrated advocacy for the idea that the Oakland District should spend at least 55% of state funding on schools and staff, as required by State Education Code.

That said, we have gathered further information on her opponent and we are now recommending a “Don’t vote for Foster” position. Beyond Foster’s strong support for the ‘Common Core’ and her support for Proposition 30, we believe that the community on both sides of this issue who might have insight as to the wisdom and impact of such changes.

While local legal community, the political community, and the legal community on both sides of this issue who might have insight as to the wisdom and impact of such changes. While local legal community, the political community, and the legal community on both sides of this issue who might have insight as to the wisdom and impact of such changes.

All of the justices agreed that they should hear the case, and determine whether or not it should appear on the ballot, but there was disagreement over whether the proposition should be removed from the ballot while the case was pending. The majority determined that it should be removed from the ballot now, with Justice Cantil-Sakay observable dissenting on that issue.

Justices Cuellar and Werdager, while voting with the majority, did not say anything about their reasoning, but Justice Liu did. In essence she stated that it is her view that the legislature is allowed to place advisory measures on the ballot, and since it does not actually do anything (like enacting a new law), there was no harm in taking it off while the case was pending. He seemed to regard Proposition 49 as an act of legislative grandstanding, rather than real legislation. Cantil-Sakay observed that there was no harm in leaving it on the ballot (perhaps because it does not really do anything). Given all of the justices, includ-

ing Cantil-Sakay, that they should think the case on the merits, this becomes a fairly narrow and technical disagreement about an abstract symbolic (although of course we Greens do oppose Citizens United) has been overwhelm by the media, and accordingly it does not change our analysis or recommendation.

None of the justices are perfect; none of them has taken a strong stand against the death penalty, for example. But all have shown at least some inclination towards helping regular people, not just large corporations or government power. Given the somewhat unusual nature of judicial retention elections, we see no clear reason to vote against their retention. We therefore recommend a “yes” vote for all three, while acknowledging that they would not have been our first choices for the job.

State Appellate Court
No Endorsements

In contrast to federal court judges, who are appointed for life by the executive branch and confirmed by the legis-
lative branch, California state judicial officers are appointed by the governor and then confirmed and retained by popular vote.

It is currently beyond the capacity of our Voter Guide volunteer staff to review every opinion that the district appellate judges have either authored or joined over the past term. We are therefore not endorsing or a “Yes” or a “No” vote on the retention/confirmation of the state appellate court judges on the ballot. Press accounts of state appellate court judicial holdings are relatively rare, and reviewing the opinions of these judges over their terms would be time-consuming.

We recommend you vote Yes on Measure BB.

Judicial Offices

State Supreme Court
Justices
Mariano-Florentino Cuellar, Goodwin Liu, Kathryn Werdager

Yes, with reservations

Liu and Cuellar are recent appointees to the California Supreme Court. Liu has been on the court since 2014, appointed by then-governor Pete Wilson. While we appreciate the racial diversity that Liu and Cuellar bring to the court, they bring little diversity of social class or professional experience. Both attended Ivy League schools, and both have primarily worked as law professors, rather than as judges or practitioners. Cuellar spent some time in the Obama White House, while Liu spent some time working for a large corporate law firm. We would prefer to see more diversity of experience and more focus on public service.

Cuellar was appointed to the California Supreme Court after it became clear that the Republicans in the US Senate were going to successfully block his appointment to the Federal 9th Circuit Court of Appeals. Governor Brown’s appointment of Liu was essentially a sharp stick in the eye of the Senate Republicans. While we enjoy a sharp stick as much as anyone, we think that Liu or by Liu’s apparent willingness to dismiss some of his own prior positions, rather than defend them, when faced with a Republican attack. If he has ambitions for a Federal Court of Appeals or Supreme Court seat, he may try to avoid controversy in his decisions, and base them on popularity rather than principle. That said, Liu has a reputation for hard work and intellectual rigour. He, like his fellow justice, remains to be seen over the long term how he performs on the California Supreme Court.

Cuellar, who was born in Mexico, is too recent of an appointee to have much of a record, particularly since he was a public figure long before his nomination to the California Supreme Court. Accordingly, it is also hard to tell how he will perform over the long term.

Werdager, despite having been appointed to the Cali-

fornia Supreme Court by Pete Wilson, has a significantly more diverse background. She entered the practice of law when it was not common for women to do so, and has a greater proportion of Latinos than Cuellar. She is currently working as a court research attorney and Court of Appeals judge. She is considered to be more toward the “liberal” side of the Court, and voted with the majority of the Court in strike down Proposition 49, the California’s Millionaire’s Marriage.

In addition, shortly before we went to press, the Court was asked whether or not Proposition 49 should stay on the ballot. The legislature placed it on the ballot as an advisory measure, to ask voters to indicate if they would support California pursuing a Constitutional amendment to overturn the US Supreme Court’s Citizens United decision.

Election day: November 4, 2014

Local areas such as ours must raise funds to replace declining Federal and State support for transportation. As a result the Alameda County Transportation Commission has placed a new transportation measure on the ballot.

Measure BB will augment and extend the existing Alameda County Measure B half-cent transportation sales tax by another half-cent, to April 1, 2045. The sunset provision—which ends the sales tax increase after 30 years—is a major improvement over the last version of this mea-
sure, which narrowly failed in 2012.

The tax increase would generate about $8 billion over the 30 years for essential transportation improvements throughout Alameda County, resulting in improved air quality and cleaner transportation options.

Revenue from the plan would restore, upgrade, and expand BART, AC Transit, and commuter rail services, and keep fares affordable for seniors, youth, and people with disabilities. Bicycle and pedestrian safety and education projects would receive major funding boosts. There are some funds for local street improvements, such as repairing potholes and seismic improvements. Nine percent would go to local highway projects such as building high-occupancy lanes. All funds will benefit Alameda County residents. Many local jobs will also be created.

Extensive opportunities for community input went into the development of this transportation plan. The resulting plan includes many specific taxpayer safeguards, such as a powerful independent watchdog committee.

Although a 30-year sales tax increase seems burden-
some, it is necessary to fund long-term improvements to transportation infrastructure visions. Federal and State grants are only available to those localities which can generate matching funds over many “life-years.”

It is true that sales taxes are regressive, meaning they impact low income people at a higher rate than higher income people (although more absolute dollars are con-

tributed by high-income high-spenders). Unfortunately, there are no good alternatives for gathering local funds. AC Transit and BART already get money from parcel taxes, and the idea of increasing parcel taxes even further is resisted by city homeowners. Gasoline taxes are already extraordinarily high (Oregon is experimenting with a Vehicle Miles Trav-
elled tax as a replacement).

There are also concerns about the 5 percent of the plan’s budget which is allocated to the Livemore BART exten-
sion. Some critics say this is too much money, some say it’s too little, and some say the entire idea must be scrapped. It is undeniably that the current issue should not stop us supporting the measure as a whole, which proposes to make many positive improvements for the people and environ-

ment of Alameda County.

We recommend you vote Yes on Measure BB.
EBMUD Board
continued from page 1

...of the Alameda Healthcare District. She holds a Bachelor's degree in Civil/Environmental Engineering from U.C.

In terms of support, Ms. Foulkes is supported by the four more conservative current EBMUD board directors as well as the two all-conservative elected officials and some officials in Orinda and Moraga. Ms. Young is supported by the more progressive current and former EBMUD directors, several Oakland City Council members, both of EBMUD’s major environmental organizations, and various political organizations and environmental organizations including Sierra Club and Clean Water Action.

The Green Party endorses and recommends voting for Ms. Young.

AC Transit, At Large

dollene Jones, with reservations

If the standard is to elect someone who will do no harm, then that would be anyone but Joel B. Young, the incumbent. He seems to be most concerned about what the board can do for him and not what he can do for AC Transit. He has used information only the board and legal staff are privy to for use by a law firm he works for. The board censored him for this. Furthermore, for most of the first year he served before he spoke. Even afterwards, he has not contributed much beyond his technical nitpicking, defending himself against the censoring and successfully convincing a reluctant board to finance a trip to Washington DC for caucus meetings that had nothing to do with transportation. The rationale was that the board had paid for Rebecca Kaplan to attend meetings unrelated to transportation in Texas when she was on the board. The board has since clarified the rules so the agency will only pay for travel to transportation relevant events.

Young did not seem to have paid attention to the staff reports prepared by AC Transit or EBMUD’s finances, as he said, “I believe that AC Transit can support an entire fleet of these buses...” If the agency did so, it would have to severely cut back service. The existing fuel cell buses were purchased with grant funds as a “Demonstration Project.” They demonstrated that they are very costly to purchase, maintain and operate, and the grant funding is ending. The best hope for an economically viable zero-emissions bus is an electric bus. A company called Proterra is developing such a bus, which can go 30 miles and recharge in 10 minutes. He may not have ridden on the demonstration model that came to AC Transit. The board members who did were very impressed.

The whole issue of clean fuel technology can be, very technical, so it is not surprising that all candidates’ answers came up short. Adrienne C. Andrews and Dollene C. Jones gave confusing answers. But AC Transit’s new management has very knowledgeable staff that can explain the varied options for anyone who will listen. Young did not seem to have.

Andrews seems to have little experience with transit but she has picked up smart growth nomenclature, which she parrots. She does not seem to get that a low cost will only save service! She would do no harm. You can view the candidate’s completed questionnaires on our website, at: http://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires/.

Jeff Davis

AC Transit, Ward 5

Ward 5 represents Fremont, Newark and portions of Hayward. Jeff Davis had 20 years of public service in transportation at the local government level before joining the Board in 2014. His knowledgeable answers were the most succinct and showed he knew what he was talking about. On the question of the use of diesel, he said, “The emissions vehicle is the most competitive.” He is a committed, valuable member of the board and should be re-elected.

It is hard to say much about his opponent, Kewal Singh, because he has said very little so far. For those interested in seeing what both candidates’ completed questionnaires on our website, at: http://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires/.

BART, District 4

Lena Tam, with reservations

The responses to our questionnaire from the incumbent, Robert Raburn, seem to describe many things that are happening at BART, but which are not his projects or a result of his leadership. The few 2014 questions, the most recent, and his responses show that he learned to repeat what was presented at various meetings, but leaves out major problems with the facts that were presented numerous times. For one, throughout the negotiations with the Unions, BART presented that it required 1000 train cars, not the 775 Director Raburn mentioned. Upon looking at the underlying numbers, the unions maintained throughout that 775 was a more realistic number and that BART was inflating its projected expenses to justify cuts in the face of apparent overwhelming surpluses. After negotiations were concluded, the BART Board of Directors voted for a 4% increase which increases the base case to 25% of the cost, that’s an estimated $600 Million that BART inflated its projected expenditures just with the number of train cars. The Board of Directors was willing to shut down the line, what an area the project development would cost more than $10 Million apart, using their numbers, which were problematic, when they actually had an extra $90 Million at hand.

Regarding the train control system, management repeatedly stated leading up to and throughout negotiations that they needed a train control system that could handle 30 trains per hour through the transbay tube - the number Director Raburn gave in his response. In numerous presentations, the Union pointed out that number was based on ridership growth projections that were unsustainable and ridership numbers of 7,500 (i.e. around 400,000), in no way to be confused with the $600 million maintenance. We guess how they managed to put a very specific price tag on something that hadn’t even been invented yet, much less available on the market.

One paragraph in Raburn’s response is titled “Improving Management Labor Relations.” The paragraph is notable for not mentioning his own congestion action, which he has been using to improve management-labor relations. He turned down the offer of the president of the BART Board of Directors to come to a summit and the management-labor relations resulted in a substantive report with 63 recommendations to provide a pathway to improve labor relations at BART. During and since negotiations, Director Raburn has maintained a solid, cold and placid presence on the part of the General Manager. When he describes in his response that he opposed strike contingency planning, his safety concerns for the public reflect the inability to properly prevent civil unrest around West Oakland station. He’s stated the same in other discussions union members have had with him. His concerns completely miss the constant safety fears and worries. BART employees with untrained and uncertified managers would be dangerous on its face: operating trains is not as simple and carefree as was relayed in the press. The Union stated consistently that new, operating trains would be focused in at least five trains with flat wheels - the result of dragging a round metal wheel on a flat steel rail. This is a major potential cause of fire. Operating trains with inexperienced people who were unfamiliar with the complicated job involved in operating trains, who had demonstrated while operating a small amount of trains that they could likely cause a fire, at the main train station, which would need to be cut through the transbay tube with fully loaded trains, was extremely dangerous. Director Raburn still to this day does not seem to grasp what the workers urgently expressed for months, yet still continues to echo positions of management without objective critic.

Regarding our question #16, Director Raburn also had an ambiguous response regarding BART Board President Kelly Jamieson’s proposal to create a single transit district or local distric—tal. He stated opposition based on the fact that there didn’t seem to be a real campaign mounted behind it. The Union was left with the impression that he would be inclined to support it if the Board were willing to put real resources behind the measure.

Raburn also missed an opportunity to answer our question #17, at least beyond the issue of hiring Hock. That’s unfortunate. The report just released by the consultant regarding BART negotiations laid out numerous recommendations on the types of things the Board can do differently. While not Director Raburn’s issue, other Board members have experience from management in question #18, the Unions were presented with a much different story and extensive detailed presentation, including potential support of initiatives supporting the initiatives Director Raburn says he supported against the wishes of the staff. The most tragic example is that Director Raburn did not challenge upper management’s runnings of trains with uncertified personnel. Director Raburn states that happened without his knowledge. However, that management was doing that was widely known.

For Larry Lieberman questions related to negotiations and the relationships, we appreciate his short and clear answer that public sector unions should have the right to express their opinions in the form of a strike. His answer to the other questions were more by a lack of grasp of the issues. He was honest in recognizing that he didn’t know enough about the question about hiring Tom Hock, but that was a topic that was covered extensively as a major issue, in a newspaper article and in an issue of a staff newsletter. I would imagine someone running for such a seat would have basic knowledge of such an issue. We’ve heard many people we’ve casually met have much more of an understanding of this issue than this candidate. Similarly on the third ques—
tion regarding independence of management: his example of standing up to management shows a lack of understanding of the role of an elected official, that his position is not subordinate to the electorate and who helps shape policy and direct management to implement such policy. Directors are not subservient to management: his example suggests the op—

Lena Tam is a member of the Alameda City Council, having served since 2006, and she is also a former President of the Alameda Healthcare District. She holds a master’s degree in Civil and Environmental Engineering from U.C.
The Peralta College Communities—Laney, Merritt, College of Alameda, and Berkeley City College—play a critical role in educating local students, most of whom are working people, children of working people, and people of color. Peralta’s mission is to educate all students, regardless of their background and ability for watching over the Peralta District Office and its four colleges.

Three seats on the Peralta Board of Trustees are up for election, but only two Peralta races will actually be on the November ballot. One incumbent is running unopposed, and the Peralta Board has opted not to pay the Alameda County Voter Registration office election fee (tens of thousands of dollars) for single-candidate races. So Linda Handy (Area 3—San Antonio, Fruitvale, Brookdale, Seminary, Maxwell Park), first elected in 2002, will not be on the ballot.

Peralta Board, Area 7

Julina Bonilla

Area 7 includes Emeryville and parts of Oakland, including Lake Merritt, Adams Point, West Oakland, and Temescal. A hot race is in progress in Area 7 since Trustee Abel Guilen has opted to run instead for Oakland City Council District 2 (see page 9). Newcomers Julina Bonilla and Richard Fuentes are vying for the Area 7 seat.

Abel Guilen has endorsed Bonilla (julinabolilla.com). We believe she is the better candidate, and we encourage you to vote for her. Bonillas background is in workforce development in Oakland and throughout Northern California, and has strong working relationships with those in the labor and career technical training sectors. Bonilla does not appear to be motivated by political ambition but rather by a deep commitment to improving educational and job prospects for our students. She is solidly backed by labor. Bonilla would provide a steady presence on the Peralta Board and is a worthy successor to Abel Guilen.

Richard Fuentes (richardfuentes.com) ran for an Oakland School Board seat unsuccessfully in 2012. We did not endorse him then and cannot now. After losing that race, he has set his sights on the Peralta Board despite his having no apparent involvement with community college or 4-year colleges or universities in the Bay Area. In public meetings, Fuentes has not been particularly ambitious and likely sees a seat on the Peralta Board as a stepping stone to future office. He has shown that he does not play well with others by publicly bashing people with whom he disagrees. His list of endorsers, including Ignacio De La Fuente, Jill Broadhurst, and Phil Tagami does not indicate a progressive bent.

Peralta Board, Area 5

David Ralston

Area 5 includes Piedmont and portions of Oakland, including Grand Lake, Upper Rockridge, Glenview, Lau- rel, and the area between Hwy 580 and Skyline to Leona Canyon. William Riley (rileytrustees.com), incumbent and senior member of the Peralta Board, was first elected in 1998. He ran unopposed in 2002 and 2006. We did not endorse him in 2006 and cannot endorse him now. His 4 terms (16 years) have been undistinguished. His responses to our questionnaire were perfunctory. Riley is a retired school administrator and has a pattern of deferating to Peralta administration, no matter the caliber. For example, former Oakland mayor Elihu Harris was Peralta Chancellor from 2003-2010 and, among other problems, Harris presided over a disastrous rollout of a new computer system that was so deficient the district had significant audit findings for several years that led to the colleges accreditation be- ing threatened. Despite that, Harris received a nice windfall in his last salary when he was very quietly retiree with a CalEERS pension of over $200,000 per year. In the meantime Part time faculty struggle with low salaries, no job security and minimal benefits. It is time to remove the vestiges of crony- ism and get new blood on the Peralta Board.

Environmentalist and planner David Ralston is chal- lenging Riley. Ralston has taught as a part-time instructor at Merritt College and lecturer at San Jose State and UC Berkeley. His response to our question about part-time/con- tingent faculty was detailed and represents understanding of the issues facing over 2/3 of the faculty in the PCCD district.

Ralston also had an intriguing suggestion that a two-thirds vote of the Board would be necessary to override key policy decisions supported by shared governance bodies.

We are pleased to see an attempt to assert the incum- bent, though we wish that Ralston had made his intention to run clear to potential supporters much earlier. Even in September, the website addresses he gave us (ralstonfor- peralta.com, Ralstonforperaltabhd.org) were not functioning.

[Later, after the paper Voter Guides were published, he gave the correct URL: http://www.ralstonforperaltabhd.org ]

That said, we encourage a vote for Ralston because he would bring a fresh perspective and creative ideas to change the status quo in Peralta.

Read the CANDIDATES’ QUESTIONNAIRES Online

For the special district races, all of the candidates returned our questionnaires, and for the city races in Alameda, Emeryville, and Oakland, almost all of them did so. You’ll find lots of additional info in the candidates’ completed questionnaires, so we strongly encourage you to read them on our website: http://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires/ (Or, you can simply go to: acgreens.org, and then click on the “Candidate Questionnaires” tab near the top of the page).
vember’s ballot means that some of the organizations who have the most thorough analysis have not had time to re-
teach this version. So we look at what, for example, the Pac-
ific Institute are saying when they look at the larger version in
2010. They compared the public statements and found an important difference. Large water projects of the
past, such as the State Water Project in 1960, provided that
all the repayment funds would come from those who used the
water (including the agribusinesses of the San Joaquin Valley). But the current proposed bond will have repayments
out of the General Fund.
Many Californians are concerned about whether this
water bond will help Governor Brown get his “enormous
tunnels” project built, the project he doesn’t want to bring
before the voters for another year. The Senate leader Bar-
bara Barra-paillir-Garrison, Restore the Delta Executive Director,
disagreed (with Governor Brown) that the bond is “tunnel-
neighbor.” She praised the contents of the bill by stating, “The
passage of a water bond with BDCP funds for flow is
unfortunate.”
“Instead of focusing on making California’s water use more
efficient, fixing our aging and leaking water system and
cleaning up our groundwater, Proposition 1 instead
focuses on building more dams, at a cost of $2.72 billion
dollars. The money to build these dams will only increase Cali-
foria’s water supply by 1 percent and won’t be usable for
decades.” This begins “the Rebuttal to Argument in Favor”
found in the “ProCALIFORNIA Informational Voter’s Guide”
still in its 20-day Public Display Period as of this writing. ([Aug. 23- Sept. 12] Opponents of Proposition 1 include As-
semblymember Wesley Chesbro, Chair, Natural Resources Committee of the California State Board of Pesticides
Watch; Zeke Grader, Executive Director, Pacific Coast
Foundation of Fishermen’s Associations; Corner Evertts, Ex-
cutive Director, California Center for Environmental Protection; and Barbara Barra-paillir-Garrison, Restore the Delta,
Executive Director, Restore the Delta. Please join us in voting no on Proposition 1.

State Propositions

Prop. 1 - continued from page 1

the added revenues with the passage of Prop. 30. It gives
government control over a much greater power (the “budget
emergency”) and for 15 years, block efforts to alter priorities.
Moreover, a new definition of “budget austerity” allows the
preparation of a new austerity proposal to be opposed and used as
a basis to explain why such fiscal reactionary (not re-
sponsibility) policy would be disastrous for working people.
Therefore, the passage of Prop. 30 is the one
answer is for Californians and even corporations who 
the rich and corporations pay (including advocating debt
cancellation).

Proposition 45 - YES

Health Insurance Rate Changes

Before commenting on Prop. 45, voters should know that
the Enrolled Party Council of the National Federation for
Medicare All minus the insurance industry. We are
working to achieve a comprehensive, coordinated and
affordable insurance program for all California residents,
including those employed by non-profit fund. In other countries with their versions of
Medicare for All, the cost for healthcare is far lower than
we pay and, they get better quality care. That, we
could also note that 36 of 50 states have the authority to control
health insurance rate hikes.

Proponents say Prop. 45 gives one politician too

much power and will create more costly bureaucracy. Propo-
nents state that California’s big health insurance companies
have already contributed enough money to campaign against
Prop. 45. Considering the projected consumer savings of
$200 million per year, there may be much more contributed
to the No on campaign before November.

An initiative to an Improved Medicare for All
may be on the ballot as soon as 2016. For Greens, the campaign
to approve Prop. 45 gives us another opportunity to talk to
talk about a better system of providing healthcare. If you believe
that insurance company rates should be regulated, we
hope you will also join us to move beyond Obamacare to an
Improved Medicare for All. Everyone deserves quality healthcare that is affordable.

Proposition 46 - NO

Drug Testing of Doctors and Medical Negligence Lawsuits

Trial lawyers want to raise the current state $250,000
limit (instituted in 1975) on “pain and suffering” damages
that are assessed in malpractice lawsuits to $1.1 million, to
keep up with inflation.

Prop. 45 adds two arguably peripheral measures, in
theory to improve the quality of health care: a) drug and
alcohol testing of doctors and reporting of positive tests
to the California Medical Board, and b) requiring health care
practitioners to consult a state prescription drug history
database before prescribing certain controlled substances.

Supporters include Consumer Attorneys of Califor-
nia, Consumer Watchdog, and Senator Boxer. Opponents
cite the American Medical Association, California Medical
Association, Insurers, hospitals, allied health professionals,
most labor unions, the ACLU, the Chamber of Commerce,
the NAACP, and the CA School Boards Association. CA Dems
and California Nurses’ Association are staying neutral.

Greens could argue either side of the payment issue.
Our broken health care system does not need to address patient
and consumer complaints about health care, but it
will payouts, and the resulting rise in malpractice insurance,
drive medical care costs even further out of reach? The
California Congressional Office says it will not significantly
raise costs, but the American Medical Association states

The drug testing section is also problematic. Health
practitioners may already be subject to either random
drug testing or testing for cause if suspected of drug diversion
or impaired practice. The tests used may not be sensitive
or specific enough to be useful.

Cost over the three years this omnibus bill is the most
worrisome, and it is even reflected in the proposi-
tion’s title. It would REQUIRE health care practitioners
to consult a state-level proprietary—software prescription
drug history database before prescribing certain controlled
substances—yet the database does not exist, but it is not required to be used (currently only 8
percent of MD’s do it).

The intent of this section is to keep people from getting
questions on the same issues the previous section’s
psychological aids, steroids) from doctors who are not aware
the person has already obtained such drugs elsewhere.
Even better, it suggests that this deleterious undermining
implementation is unworkable and even frightening. For example,
most medical professionals are open to political manipulation over time. This law
was to take personal control even further away from individuals.

Your entire prescription drug history will be in this web-
based database for all the world to see, if it gets hacked.
People who might be looking for something to use against you (reporters, custody lawyers, job background checkers,
precious but Proposition 47 brings this State essentially al-
ready a lawsuit about privacy concerns around this database,
and the patient apparently lost.

The initiative is between three separate propositions.
Again, what we need is Improved Medicare for All (Single
Payer) Now. Vote NO.

Proposition 47 - YES

with great embarrassment and
disappointment because much
more needs to be done

Criminal Sentences, Misdemeanors Penalties

Proposition 47, the Criminal Sentences, Misdemeanor
Penalties Initiative, would decriminalize low-level
poverty and lumpiness of the public debate over criminal
justice policy. It does not confront the almost total failure
and tragedy-making of California’s prison and jail system.
When we use the word “criminal” in California, it stands
as a measure, the arguments for or against Proposition
47 concern only about 3 percent of the nine (9) billion dollar cost of the 230,000 annual incarceration.
The sentencing of maybe 5 percent will be changed by passage
of this initiative. Every life is important and every dollar
is precious but Proposition 47 brings this State essentially no

Continuous on page 15
tencing Project recently reported that the budget-forced and/or court-forced prison population reductions have resulted in crime rate declines faster than the national average rather than creating the opposition predicts.
In the last 30 years California has built 22 new prisons but only one university. This tragic waste of our resources has to stop. Proposition 47 is a tiny step in the right direction. It is just not enough.

Proposition 48 - NO (Don’t approve the compacts)
Indian Gaming Referendum

This proposition concerns some Indian gaming compacts which would allow a large casino to be built about four miles north of the City of Madera -- and NOT on the tribe’s reservation. Last year the state legislature barely approved a bill (SB 497) which allowed this project to move forward. (Only 41 out of 80 Assemblymembers voted for it, and only 22 out of 40 State Senators voted for it.) After Governor Brown signed the bill, a referendum campaign ensued to overturn the bill, to prevent this casino from being built, and because the referendum qualified for the ballot, it is now before us, the voters. Under California law, a “Yes” vote on a referendum allows the original legislation to remain in force, and a “No” vote overturns that legislation. Therefore, voting “Yes” on Prop. 48 allows this casino to be built, and voting “No” on Prop. 48 prevents the casino from being built.

As we have previously written, we support tribal sovereignty over tribal lands. That’s why we supported Prop. 5 in 1998, which was when statewide voters first cast lots approving of Indian gaming in California. However, the casino under consideration in Prop. 48 is NOT on the tribes’ reservation. Rather, the land for the casino was only acquired by the tribe in 2012, following a 2005 request to the federal government to obtain the land for the purpose of gaming. Therefore, the question here is instead whether casino gaming should be allowed in or near cities and towns opposed to this being a question about tribal sovereignty over tribal land.

This good evidence that gambling casinos tend to lead to an increase an crime (see: http://casinosforfreedomphilly.org/casino-facts/gambling-and-crime). There is also good evidence that they lead to an increase in gambling addiction (see: http://www.casinosforfreedomphilly.org/casino-facts/gambling-addiction). Furthermore, as Greens work to create a more just, humane, and sustainable society, we cannot build gambling casinos (and especially in or near urban areas) don’t really fit in with how we’d like to see our future unfold. Therefore, because the main issue here is really about whether gambling casinos should be built in or near cities, we urge you to vote “No” on Proposition 48.

U.S. Representative, District 13
Boycott this race

How Hosting a Party in Martha’s Vineyard, MA, Can Win a Seat in Congress in Oakland and Berkeley, CA

To-date (August 7, 2014), incumbent Democrat Barbara Lee has raised $40,921.73 while her opponents have spent $7,720.38 in the primary election campaign periods. Of that, $299,460 has been spent on “Funding Consultants,” in addition, she has $5,250 listed as a campaign expense for Mad Max Sailing Adventures, Martha’s Vineyard, MA. The total expenses for the two parties (one in 2013, the other 2014) listed on her FEC filings is $18,393.

Aside from a company called ActBlue, which is a company that handles your online donations, which is headquarter- ed in Cambridge, MA, she only has $5,500 listed as contributions from the state of Massachusetts from 4 people.

The question remains why someone would pay a fund- raising consultant so much money for such bad advice. And why is Representative Lee hosting parties 3,000 miles from home to win an election which she has never won with less than 80 percent of the vote?

She has collected money from some big corporations, some of whom are big defense contractors, including Lock- heed Martin and General Electric. There’s only one big corporate donation from her own district, and that’s from Clorotz ($4,000).

Duke Energy, of Charlotte, NC, (which operates nuclear and coal powered electric plants) has given Lee $2,500 and they don’t have any holdings in California.

Here is a list of her corporate paymasters: Angen, BNSF Railways, Clorotz, Duke Energy, CWA (an organ- ization that fails to recognize the unpaid staff at KPFA), General Electric, Google, Lockheed Martin, McDonald’s, National Beer Wholesalers, Novartis, Sallie Mae, Realto rs PAC, T-Mobile, UPS and Walgreens.

In addition, Barbara Lee not only takes in bad money, she also from time to time dishes out some terrible policy. Though Lee has been better than most in Congress (a very low bar to be sure) in giving gift-service to opposing the Israeli occupation of Palestine, she still supports “robust military aid to Israel,” despite its war crimes against the people of Gaza and all of occupied Palestine. Even as US- made bombs fall on high-rise apartment buildings, and UN schools sheltering civilians, Lee has refused to repudiate her position, instead encouraging only more toothless di- plomacy -- and voting for more rewards for Israel. Sadly, the “renegade for peace and justice” she advertises herself to be.

We recommend that you not cast a vote in this race as it is an affirmation of a corrupt system.

State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Don’t vote for Tuck

This election is nominally a non-partisan race but in- volves two candidates who are all clearly aligned with one of the two parties of business. That said, there are significant differences in their policies.

Tom Torlakson is the current office holder and is one of the main representatives of the so-called “labor Democrats.” He is heavily backed by the two main educator unions, the California Teachers Association and the California Federation of Teachers, as well as the state AFL-CIO.

While in many cases this is not a factor to consider sup- port, the assault on public education makes consideration for Torlakson a factor, especially with no left alternative. He opposes the testing regime (at least in opposition to the federal guidelines, for which there is currently a moratorium in California) and the expansion of charter schools. Also important is the state position in opposition in the Verga case which would undermine seniority and due process for 275,000 teachers in the state.

The other candidate is abyssal: Marshall Tuck is clearly a ‘corporate Democrat’. He is a former investment banker for Salomon Brothers as well as the president of Green Dot Charter Schools. This network entered into a partnership in the Los Angeles school district, aided by the former mayor, Antonio Villaraigosa; in addition, he is backed by such anti-union education reformers as Michelle Rhee, head of the DC schools. He is certainly an advocate for expanding repressive testing criteria and overt privatization.

We are not endorsing Torlakson. We regret that no non- corporative candidate ran this time. However, we strongly urge you NOT to vote for Tuck.

State Assembly District 15
Don’t vote for Echoh

Even though Greens and other third parties have been disenfranchised by “top two” in the other state races, As- sembly 15 voters have a real choice in this race. Emerging from the pile of the eight candidate primary are two Demo- crats, former Richmond City Councilmember and former West Contra Costa School Board member Tony Thurmond, and Elizabeth Echoh, the local democratic party machine’s handpicked successor to Nancy Skinner, with no elected experience.

Tony Thurmond is a hands-on type of public official, with a social worker background, and a long record of good work both in office and in the community. Thurmond had many good responses to our primary questionnaire, especially regarding health care (support for a single payer system) and on environmental issues, including his experi- ence having taken on and beaten Chevron when he was on the City Council. He also supports taxing the wealthiest one percent of Californians, reforming Proposition 13 and reforming the 2/3 vote requirement, and promoting an oil extraction fee. He has many progressive endorsements, including several of the left of center candidates from the primary. If elected, Tony would be the only African Ameri- can in the legislature from Northern California.

Elizabeth Echoh declined to answer our questionnaire. Her public policy statements sound good but lack any specificity. She has never held elective office, is not known in activist circles, and it’s unclear why any of the jobs she lists as experience qualify her to be in the Assembly, includ- ing a long stint at Google. Her main qualification appears to be serving on the Democratic Party Central Committee and being endorsed by her predecessors. While Echoh might adequately represent District 15, Thurmond’s real experience, making tough decisions in favor of people and the environment. Because we traditionally do not endorse Democrats (or Republicans) in partisan races, our position for this race is “Don’t vote for Echoh.”

Go Paperless

The PDF version of this Voter Guide is available at http://californiangreens.wordpress.com/voter-guides/. Would you like to save some trees and printing/postage costs? PLEASE LET US KNOW at acrew@californiangreens.org that you prefer to receive email (with our Green Voter Card plus a link to the full Voter Guide online) instead of printed copies. Printed copies (for your use, and to distribute) will always be available at our Green Party headquarters at 2022 Blake Street, Berkeley, CA 94704; (510) 644- 2293. Donations of any amount are encouraged (but not required).

Thanks everyone!
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