U.S. President and Vice President Jill Stein and Ajamu Baraka

Against this backdrop, when Jill Stein appears on the news in her lavender blazer, energetic, optimistic and wise, to talk about a bright possible future where war and weapons are transformed into clean energy jobs and free education, the relief and excitement many Americans feel is palpable and real. By August her poll numbers were up to 4 percent nationwide and over 10 percent in California among voters under 30 (higher than Trump’s numbers). As a mother, Harvard-educated physician, and long-time teacher of internal medicine, Stein has led initiatives promoting healthy communities, local green economies, and the revitalization of democracy—claiming issues such as campaign finance reform, green jobs, racially-just redistricting, and the cleanup of incinerators, coal plants, and toxic sites.

In August, Stein chose longtime human rights activist Ajamu Baraka as her running mate. Baraka has served on the boards of Amnesty International, Center for Constitutional Rights, and Africa Action, and is currently an associate fellow at the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington, D.C. Following a CNN Town Hall appearance together, Stein / Baraka received significant media coverage. Among others, the LA Times and Fresno Bee even called for the inclusion of Stein (and Libertarian candidate, Gary Johnson) in the debates. We give a strong YES to Prop. 64.

Oakland School Board, District 1
Don Macleay

The endorsement of Don Macleay is not simply based on his active involvement with the Green Party and his having run in previous local Oakland elections. It is about the contrast with his opponent, Jody London. London was first on the School Board in 2009 and was reelected in 2012; she has served several stints as president and vice-president of the board. She has been visible in support of cutting funding measures such as Measure B and two parcel tax initiatives. She has focused energy on school facilities. Her work is around public policy, especially on energy issues and she is supportive of public partnerships with business.

As a reward for this rightward shift, she will be supported in this election by Great Oakland (GO) Public Schools, the main purveyor of corporate domination of school districts in Oakland. They will undoubtedly spend tens or hundreds of thousands to elect their corporate candidates, just as they did in the last school board election.

Don Macleay is not simply different from the incumbent on macro-policies regarding the deficits linked to privatization and the standardized testing regime. Equally important, Don will bring a fervor to involve residents, parents, and students throughout the District in making decisions and involvement in school sites.

Berkeley Measures

Proposition 64 - YES Marijuana Legalization

Prop. 64, the California Marijuana Legalization Initiative would legalize marijuana and hemp under state law and enact certain sales and cultivation taxes. The time has finally come for cannabis to come “out of the shadows” in California. Since 2012, it has now in four other western states (WA, CO, OR, AK). It is pretty clear where the benefits are: less money to crime syndicates both domestically and in Mexico; fewer people put in jail for trivial issues that do not affect actual crime on others; and more revenue for the state to educate about drug issues, clean the environment, and help law enforcement, among other things. Most reasonable people have known for a long time that legalization is not only a rational path to drug policy for multiple reasons, but is virtually inevitable, eventually, across the country. This proposition is almost sure to pass this time, according to public polling, and has only limited opposition. Some opposition comes from certain sectors of law enforcement that have habitually opposed any sort of legalization like marijuana. These groups have been outspent by the canonical bebop to push certain predisposed young people out of the line of fire (an issue which needs more study).

At this point, however, going the “prohibition” route to controlling cannabis consumption is not helping these vulnerable people, nor anyone else. Anyone can get it without much difficulty in the state (and country), and what is needed is to integrate it into our overall public health system, instead of seeing it as “demon weed” outside the scope of civilized society when everyone is aware that, in fact, it’s all around us.

We give a strong YES to Prop. 64.
The “GPAC” is one of the few County Councils that produce a Voter Guide for each election. We mail about 7,000 voter guides 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 our “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 table, precinct walking, phone banking, and other volunteer activities.

The Green Party County Council meets in the evening on the second Sunday each month at 6:45pm. This is the regular “business” meeting of the Alameda County 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:
Green Party of Alameda County
Phone: (510) 644-2293
Website: www.acgreens.wordpress.com
Email lists: To join a discussion of issues and events with other active Greens, send an email to: GreenPartyofAlamedaCounty-subscribe@yahoogroups.com.
(All one word, no spaces, but a dash between County-sub.
for others we conducted over-the-phone or in-person
information for the candidates and solicited their responses.

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. We 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 only endorse bond measures for essential public purposes and are unlikely to be funded otherwise. Our endorsement “Yes, with standard bond reservations” reflects our position that funding through bonds is more costly and offers 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 our Voter Guide is fun! Give us a call now to get signed up to help on the next edition!

Green Party of Alameda County
2022 Blake Street, Suite A, Berkeley, CA 94704-2604
(510) 644-2293 • www.acgreens.wordpress.com

Name:
Phone (h):
Phone (w):
Address:
City/ZIP:

email address:

Enclose your check made out to “Green Party of Alameda County” or provide your credit card information below.

Credit card #: 
Exp: 
Signature: 

3-digit code on back of card: 

Include your email address if you want updates on Green Party activities between elections.

If you’d like to volunteer your time, check here and we’ll contact you.

There’s much to do, and everyone’s skills can be put to use.

State law requires that we report contributor’s:

Occupation:

Employer:

Thanks for your contribution of:

$1 $5 $10 $25 $50 $100 $500 $1000

The Green Party of Alameda County

Locals:
Alameda County Green Sundays: 2nd Sundays, at 5 pm; Nibley-Proctor Library, 6501 Telegraph Ave. at 65th St., Oakland. (510) 644-2293
Albany and Berkeley Greens: We are working on a number of November candidate and ballot measure contests. To join our email list, and for more information, contact: http://lists.risoup.net/www/Info/berkeleygreens- (510) 644-2293
Oakland-Emeryville-Piedmont Green Party: We are actively running a local Green Party candidate in the November election. Please join us as soon as you possibly can. For additional info, please see our website, YahooGroup, or telephone us: 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 to re-active an East County and a South County local if interested, please contact: Maxine Daniel (510) 459-7610, maxine.daniel@gmail.com.

Credits:
Our voter guide team includes: David Arkin, Jan Arnold, Virginia Ashley, Bill Balderston, Paul Burton (page layout), Harry Chomsky/Vicente Cruz, Mica Daniel, Brian Donahue, Chris Finn, Brian Geiser, Mandeegeel, Brian Good, Dave Heller, Greg Jan, Saed Karamooz, Michael Kaufman, Tina Kimmel, Bob Marsh, Pam Marsh, Hugh Moore, Sammarah Morgan, David Morrison, Michael Rubin, Susan Schachter, Bob Sciffield, John Selwdyky, Larry Shoup, Phoebu Sorgen, Kent Sparkler, Pam Spevack, Lisa Stephens, Joan Strasser, Laura Wells, and Nan Wishner.

Support Your Green Party!

The Green Party cannot exist without your help. Unlike some political parties, we do not receive funding from large, multinational polluting corporations. Instead we rely on donations from generous people just like you.

In addition, our mailing and printing costs have significantly increased over the past several years. 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.

Some races aren’t on the ballot.

Due to our interest in political analysis 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 not to print in your voter guide race(s) for more than one candidate in your ballot. Where we have comments on those races or candidates you will find them on our web blog site (www.acgreens.wordpress.com). Please check it out.

Our online Voter Guide
You can also read our Voter Guide online at http://acgreens.wordpress.com/voter-guides

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. We 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 only endorse bond measures for essential public purposes and are unlikely to be funded otherwise. Our endorsement “Yes, with standard bond reservations” reflects our position that funding through bonds is more costly and offers 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 our 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 great schools, parks, highways, health care and other vital services, and at the same time we educate and organize to promote real solutions.

Bonds have been sold to voters as “no new taxes” rather than “spend now and make kids pay later, with interest.”

Bonds are less progressive and more regressive, taxing the poor more than the rich. California can keep the good and fix the bad in Prop 13, but neither majority Democrats nor minority Republicans use their power to promote real solutions.

Property taxes before Prop 13 came primarily from commercial properties, and now primarily from homes. Homeowner tax sales, which are reasoned to be tax loopholes allow corporate properties to escape reassessment.

Parcel taxes are often the same for large properties and small condos. For some voter parcel taxes are outstripping their basic property taxes.

Sales taxes have been relied upon for balancing budgets, and weigh heavily given that, as updated annually by the California Budget Project, when looking at family income, the poorest 20 percent pay more of their income in state and local taxes than the richest 1 percent. This continues to be the case even after Proposition 30’s tax rate increases. Those who earn over 10 percent and those who average $1.6 million pay 8.8 percent.

With Reservations we endorse funding when needed for vital services, and at the same time we educate and organize for better ways of raising revenue in the future.

Voter Guide Contributions

We would like to thank the campaigns, businesses, and individuals whose donations allowed us to produce this voter guide. For more information on the candidates and campaigns, please be assured that we conducted our endorsement process first. No candidates or measures 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 a candidate’s financial support during the endorsement process. The Green Party County Council voted not to accept contributions from for-profit corporations. If you have questions about our funding process, call us at (510) 644-2293.
It's Important to Vote Green in Blue (and Red) States
(or Why You Don't Have to Vote for Hillary to Defeat Trumpslatin)

“We can list all the reasons people are told to silence themselves and vote for a lesser evil candidate: ... jobs going overseas, the climate meltdown, expanding wars... Look around. This is exactly what we’ve gotten, much of it under a Democratic White House. The lesser evil... leaves no way of discerning majoritarian from real states. In a proxy war, 'coexist' means vote for the lesser of two evils. Voting... is the practical urgency of defeating Donald Trump must override the principle of voting one’s conscience. But whatever its merits, the logic of the ‘sleeper effect’ does not apply in California. In California, we live in a deep blue state. This means that statewide, the vote is overwhelmingly likely to go to a Democrat. Our state is so blue that the only two choices in the Senate race are Democrats. California’s Electoral College votes are awarded as ‘winner-take-all.’ This means that effectively we don’t have a say in who wins the presidency. If Hillary wins the state by one vote, or ten million, she gets all California’s Electoral College votes. You may ask, ‘In this close election, what if Drumpf von Cowface wins the state?’ Remember that California ten million, she gets every Electoral College vote. College votes are awarded as ‘winner-take-all.’ This means that effectively we don’t have a say in who wins California. The only two choices in the Senate race are Democrats. California’s Electoral College votes are awarded as ‘winner-take-all.’ This means that effectively we don’t have a say in who wins the presidency. If Hillary wins the state by one vote, or ten million, she gets all California’s Electoral College votes. You may ask, ‘In this close election, what if Drumpf von Cowface wins the state?’ Remember that California

U.S. Senator No Endorsement

Our world is in crisis because an economic system based on ecocide—capitalism—is globally dominant and lives through consumption and a lesser evil, threatening the entire web of life by gradually but inexorably destroying a stable biosphere, climate system and our oceans. Time is short to avoid global catastrophe and turn this system around, and generous doses of both farsighted leadership and mass participation will be needed. Alas, no such leaders can be found among the two status quo candidates on the ballot for U.S. Senate this year. Due to the unfair “top two” electoral system currently in use in California (see box), there are only two Democrats on the ballot. Both Loretta Sanchez and Kamala Harris are establishment candidates run by a corporate and plutocratic agenda, ignoring the planet, is also left out of the Harris program. Harris, like other-die capitalism, which must not be continued on our finite planet. Harris, like other-die capitalism, which must not be continued on our finite planet. Harris, like other-die capitalism, which must not be continued on our finite planet.

Harris' rapid and easy rise to prominence and power has apparently gone to her head and detailed reports of her "diva lifestyle" and demands for "luxury living" have surfaced. One former aide stated that she treats her campaign funds like a personal checking account. An examination of her campaign spending would be instructive. Harris’s political orientation can be summed up by her endorsement of Hillary Clinton for president: “I’m excited to stand with Hillary Clinton...I have a deep admiration for her.” The issues she is running on reflect the usual winning California, Trump will overwhelmingly carry the state and our country. But, you may ask, “Don’t we have to vote for the Hillary to stop The Donkey of the Decade?” Not if you live in a deep blue or deep red state. It might be a quest to find the lesser evil in the battleground states, but not here. In deep blue or deep red states, you are free to vote for someone you believe in, not just the “lesser of two evils.” And if millions of Bernie supporters and others, vote for Green Party presidential candidate Jill Stein, it will signal to the new Democratic administration the importance of the revolution Bernie’s voters started is far from over. Over the more votes Jill gets, the more powerful the signal.

Whether or not you choose to vote for Jill Stein, you can exert powerful political pressure by registering with the Greens. The Green Party, like Bernie Sanders, rejects corporate money, and the Green platform has all the good stuff the Bernie folks couldn’t get the Democrats to accept, and more. In addition to the policy statement registering Greens, it also plants a progressive flag for candidates and just plain folks wishing to organize using the voter registration rolls. You may not get as much junk mail before the next election, but the quality will be much better.
U.S. Government, State Senate, State Assembly

State Senate, District 9
No Endorsement

We favor Senate candidates better of the only two choices. It is against our policy to endorse Democrats in “partisan” races, even if your only choices are Democrats. Whoever wins will be one of the most progressive senators in the state. See their responses to our questionnaire.

Before the Assembly, Sandre Swanson had 30 years of political experience, working for Congress persons Ron Dellums and then Barbara Lee. He is committed to growing the middle class and sustainable jobs, at-risk youth, the victims of human trafficking, worker rights, and a “state budget that is not balanced on the backs of the most vulnerable and voiceless in our society.” He supports tuition-free higher education starting with the community colleges.

As evidence of a principled progressive voice, he cites his “no” votes that eliminated the “Healthy Families Act,” moved $740,000 poor children to Medi-Cal, and on measures that would undermine collective bargaining rights. He also voted “no” on cap-and-trade during the recession; a vote that cost him the chairmanship of the Labor Committee.

In 2010, he joined with Greens in speaking out forcefully against the “Top Two” primary.

His endorsers include Loni Hancock, Barbara Lee, Berkeley City Councilmembers Andersson, Arreguin and Worthington, the Wellstone Renewable Democratic Club and LOTs of labor unions. If elected, he will be the only Afro-American American to ever serve in the State Senate in more than two decades.

Nancy Skinner served on the Berkeley City Council and the East Bay Regional Parks District Board. She is running for the Assembly District 15 to elevate the wages of hotel workers to a living wage. She is not very concrete or complete. The only question that she fully answered was his list of endorsements (primarily corporate).

Her endorsements include the mayor of the district in 2015, the Sierra Club, former Secretary of Labor Robert Reich, a few unions, and a large list of elected officials. Currently, only 12 of the 40 State Senators are women.

State Assembly, District 15
No Endorsement

The Assembly District 15 covers the area from North Oakland through Berkeley, Richmond, and San Pablo, to Pinole. The Assembly member is Robert Bonta, who is also Assemblymember for the Assembly District 14.

Incumbent Tony Thurmond’s answers to our detailed and concrete questionnaire were mostly vague generalities. He named several times his website, but the main website is not very concrete or complete. The only question that he fully answered was his list of endorsements (primarily the Democratic machine). His votes have been standard Democratic votes.

The most detailed answer Thurmond gave was to a specific question about how he plans to address budget deficits: “I believe we need to bring more fairness to our tax system, including extending Prop. 30, reforming the 2/3 requirement for passage of tax measures and reforming Prop. 13.” This is a step in the right direction, but it does not address exactly how he would counter the powerful forces which support the current tax system.

In some cases, Thurmond’s questionnaire answer was deliberately misleading. For example, when asked “What must a constituent do in order to meet with you?”, he answered, “All I ask of my constituents is to contact one of my offices to set up an appointment.” In fact, that appointment will be with one of Thurmond’s staffers. Thurmond himself does not work the actual constituent’s issues.

We very badly need to put a viable progressive into this important seat.

State Assembly, District 18
No Endorsement

The Democratic Party incumbent, Rob Bonta, represents all of Oakland County, Berkeley, Richmond and San Pablo to Pinole.

Bonta is moving toward more progressive time. We appreciate that he returned the Green Party questionnaire, but he did not return our污染者的电话. He is not the best of the only two choices.

In 2015 Bonta supported the unpopular mandatory vaccination act SB 277 — which is a windfall for the pharmaceutical industry — after accepting tens of thousands of dollars in donations from them. But Bonta may have learned from this experience, because in his 2016 questionnaire he says he “stood up against the pharmaceutical industry, including by supporting AB 463, the Pharmaceutical Cost Transparency Act of 2016, which would have required disclosure of additional information [on expensive pharmaceutical treatments].”

Bonta claims “I have not taken any donations from Big Oil, Big Tobacco, or WalMart,” which is great. Of course, that still leaves a lot of corporations from whom he has accepted money.

Bonta’s only opponent is Roseann Slosny-Breault, who is an officer of the California Federation of Republican Women. We appreciate her responding to some of the Green Party questions, but her non-specific, polemical responses are far more conservative than Bonta’s. “We have too many government entitlement programs.” “I oppose single payer health care. The free market system allows patients to work together with their own doctors to have the best health care.” “We need less regulation for businesses.” “Raising the minimum wage hurts the young and less educated workers, it becomes even more difficult for them to find jobs.”

The Assembly District 18 has lots of great progressive people in it. We need to keep encouraging Bonta — or whoever holds this seat — to accurately represent and lead their constituency.

** GO PAPERLESS **

The PDF version of this Voter Guide is available at acgreens.wordpress.com/voter-guides. Would you like to save some trees and postage costs? PLEASE LET US KNOW at acgreenparty@aol.com 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!
Scott Jackson

This November there will be only one contested judicial race in Alameda County. Neither of the candidates is a white male, so either would add diversity to the bench. Both are qualified and have relevant experience. Judicial elections can be an important way to advance social justice. It was the judiciary that ruled against segregation and for marriage equality.

Scott Jackson is Director of the Litigation Center at Golden Gate University Law School. He has experience in criminal law as an Alameda County Deputy DA, and in civil law as a partner at Donahue Fitzgerald. He served on the Board of the Volunteer Legal Services Corporation, which provides free legal aid to poor people. He is still on the Board of Elizabeth House, a transition program for vulnerable Oakland mothers. After earning a J.D. at George Washington University Law School, he clerked for the U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights Division during which he was involved in investigating a wave of 145 burnings of Black churches.

In requesting our endorsement, Jackson touted his “long history of civic engagement and commitment to progressive values.” He wrote that throughout his career he has “sought to use the law to positively impact the community.” He has been endorsed by Local 2021, Black Voters Matter, and the Alameda County Democratic Party. In his personal life, Jackson is married with two children and resides in a walkable apartment in the heart of Piedmont, where he can easily access public transportation.

Measures B1 - YES Continuation of School Parcel Tax

Measure B1 will renew the current parcel tax for education and other district expenses. The measure is a renewal of a tax that was first approved in 2012. The parcel tax provides about 20% of the district’s operating budget and helps to support the district’s operating expenses. Without this tax, the district would face significant cuts in its budget and would be forced to make difficult choices about how to allocate its resources.

Measure K1 - NO Transfer of $3.7 Million Annually from Alameda Municipal Power to the City

The city utility tax measure on the November ballot is three proposals rolled into one. In addition to broadening the existing Alameda Municipal Power tax by charging users of internet phone service the same tax as landlines, the measure affirms the current practice of diverting over $2.8 million of utility ratepayer money annually to the City of Alameda. This money could be used to create local microgrid solar and battery storage facilities for green self-reliance and to maintain our electrical infrastructure and streetlights. Many of the city’s streetlights are rusted and have not been repainted in decades.

The $2.8 million goes into the city’s general fund, which is used to pay for employees and services. According to public records, in 2015 there were 157 city employees with combined annual income and benefits of between $200,000 and $400,000. The measure decreases the number of senior citizens eligible for the utility tax exemption by raising the age of the recipient from 62 to 65. Many of those currently on social security will find their taxes increasing.

While we don’t mind the city collecting equal taxes from all Alamedans, Alameda utility bills should not be used to support those with higher incomes at the expense of senior citizens and our public infrastructure. We urge a No vote on K1.
and currently owns a home near Webster Street. Tony is very accessible and easy to talk to, holding coffee hours twice a month. His votes reflect an independent, critical position on political developments. He proposes the currently underway $400,000 citywide transportation and transit planning study, although some would rather see those resources spent directly on implementation. His answers to the Green Party Questionnaire sound moderately anti-development, pro-rent-control, etc. However, he has come out publicly as being pro-development and anti-rent- control, and he has sponsored a resolution urging the City to make some effort to prevent the homelessness. So we wonder whether he is just getting better at spinning his moderate positions.

We recommend you do not vote for Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft or Malia Vella, who are funded by the conservative Alamedans United PAC. Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft is running for a second term on the council. She is a long-time resident of Alameda and lives in the Gold Coast neighborhood. Her campaign finance statements often took on the character of safe moderate-liberal boilerplate.

Malia Vella did not return a questionnaire. She is a first-time candidate who is also funded by the conservative Alamedans United PAC. Vella moved to Alameda five years ago and lives in Central Alameda.

City Auditor
Kevin Kearney

City Treasurer
Kevin Kennedy

Both of these elected officials have been very accessible to citizens and citizen groups for candid explanations of city finances. They are both vastly more informed when it comes to characterizing the city’s financial health. They don’t gloss over the facts and they will often share clear explanations of the city’s financial data. Their public presentations are interesting and are always happily welcomed by some members of the council. We found it strange that the responses to our questionnaire from Mike McMahon (who is running against Kearney) stated that he would suggest eliminating the Alcide’s resolution because, in his words, “the position is no longer necessary” (!). No explanation or evidence was given for this idea. McMahon also stated that “no one is going to have to live in our city where housing is more affordable and ecologically sustainable.”

Measure N1 - YES Residential Parking Requirements

In 1978, at the same time that California voters approved the infamous Proposition 13, Albany voters instituted strict parking rules requiring two off-street spaces for every residential unit. People who lived here did not want to compete for open spots. They may have believed that the process of representative democracy to respect their wishes. They appreciated the excess of street parking that made it easy to drive everywhere and park without having to pay or compete for open spots. They may have believed that when more houses had ample off-street parking, residents would choose to use it and keep more street spaces empty.

Most of these ideas seem outdated today. Many of us prefer compact neighborhoods that are walkable and bikeable, with a variety of housing sizes serving diverse income levels, good access to public transit, and shopping nearby. Albany enjoys some of these benefits but not all. In particular, the parking requirements force new housing to be larger and more spread out. This makes housing more expensive, less convenient, and raises our per-capita carbon footprint.

Even the goal of easy street parking cannot be achieved by mandating more off-street parking. Many people just fill their garages with junk and park on the street anyway. When public policy imposes all the costs of building and maintaining street parking on taxpayers, not on the people who use it, it encourages people to own more cars and keep them on the street, regardless of off-street options.

Measure N1 takes a small step toward reform. It does not change the old parking rules right away -- it just puts the rules under the authority of the City Council. The Council will then deliberate in its usual fashion, with public comment, and change the rules over time. A starting point might be to encourage transit-oriented development along San Pablo Avenue and to keep parking requirements just in that zone or just for certain qualifying projects.

By passing Measure N1, Albany residents can put ineffectual “ballot box zoning” behind us, and instead start a conversation about modernizing parking rules to encourage housing that is more affordable and ecologically sustainable.

Measure O1 - YES Soda Tax

The health and well-being of Americans has improved dramatically with the success of anti-smoking programs during recent decades. Cigarette taxes have played an important role in that success, by making cigarettes more expensive in order to obtain and by raising money to pay for other anti-smoking programs. Now we face a similar public health crisis with obesity and diabetes. Should soda taxes be part of the solution?

Soda is a significant contributor to the obesity epidemic and diabetes. Should soda taxes be part of the solution?

Soda taxes can be part of the solution to this epidemic. New York City’s soda tax was implemented in 2015 and has been effective. The tax has led to a decrease in soda consumption, which could help reduce obesity rates.

The tax also raises revenue for New York City, which can be used to fund public health initiatives. This is particularly important for low-income communities, which are disproportionately affected by the epidemic of obesity and diabetes.

We recommend voting yes on Measure N1, which would implement a soda tax in Albany. The tax would help reduce obesity rates and raise revenue for public health initiatives.

Measure Q1 - YES Vacancy Procedures, Pension Board, Copies, Etc.

Measure R1 - YES Civil Service Board

Measure S1 - YES School Board Removal of Term Limits

Voters often impose term limits when they feel that their elected officials are just insiders who don’t represent their constituents. However, the limits can impede the operations of government by forcing out experienced, strong legislators and replacing them with newcomers who may take years to get fully up to speed. When elected representatives are less effective, professional staff and special interests tend to exercise their power with fewer constraints, making governance less democratic overall. Many non-partisan “good government” advocates oppose term limits for these reasons.

The Green Party seems to have varying views on the subject. Jill Stein supports term limits for US Congress, but mainly because of the disastrous performance of that particular body. Many Greens prefer to focus on improving electoral processes in other ways, such as instant runoff proportional representation, rather than just kicking out incumbents and hoping for the best.

For Albany’s school district, the strongest argument for limits is to prevent the board from becoming dominated by long-time incumbents who no longer have school-age children. Without limits, voters can still replace out-of-touch board members when necessary through ordinary elections.

We suggest voting yes on Measure S1, to remove term limits for Albany’s school board and restore the basic democratic process for selecting representatives.

Erik Giesen-Fields, with reservations

Do not vote for Michael Barnes

Five candidates are running for three open Albany City Council seats. Green Party questionnaires were sent to all candidates. Four returned the questionnaires; candidate Barnes declined to respond. Based on their questionnaire responses and track records, two candidates clearly merit, Green Party voters’ support. The remaining candidates exhibit a range of strengths and weaknesses; the gradation of endorsements given to them reflects our assessment of those pluses and minuses.

We recommend our passageway of Albany ballot measures N1 (parking requirements) and P1 (sidewalk parcel tax).

City Auditor
Kevin Kearney

City Treasurer
Kevin Kennedy

School Board

Unfortunately, we were not able to cover this race. Please see the candidates’ completed questionnaires at:
https://agreq.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires/Alamedans, please help us!

Measure Q1 - YES Vacancy Procedures, Pension Board, Copies, Etc.

Measure R1 - YES Civil Service Board

Measure S1 - YES School Board Removal of Term Limits

Voters often impose term limits when they feel that their elected officials are just insiders who don’t represent their constituents. However, the limits can impede the operations of government by forcing out experienced, strong legislators and replacing them with newcomers who may take years to get fully up to speed. When elected representatives are less effective, professional staff and special interests tend to exercise their power with fewer constraints, making governance less democratic overall. Many non-partisan “good government” advocates oppose term limits for these reasons.

The Green Party seems to have varying views on the subject. Jill Stein supports term limits for US Congress, but mainly because of the disastrous performance of that particular body. Many Greens prefer to focus on improving electoral processes in other ways, such as instant runoff proportional representation, rather than just kicking out incumbents and hoping for the best.

For Albany’s school district, the strongest argument for limits is to prevent the board from becoming dominated by long-time incumbents who no longer have school-age children. Without limits, voters can still replace out-of-touch board members when necessary through ordinary elections.

We suggest voting yes on Measure S1, to remove term limits for Albany’s school board and restore the basic democratic process for selecting representatives.

Erik Giesen-Fields, with reservations

Do not vote for Michael Barnes

Five candidates are running for three open Albany City Council seats. Green Party questionnaires were sent to all candidates. Four returned the questionnaires; candidate Barnes declined to respond. Based on their questionnaire responses and track records, two candidates clearly merit, Green Party voters’ support. The remaining candidates exhibit a range of strengths and weaknesses; the gradation of endorsements given to them reflects our assessment of those pluses and minuses.

We recommend our passageway of Albany ballot measures N1 (parking requirements) and P1 (sidewalk parcel tax).

continued on next page
questionnaire did not ask about other measures; however, we are aware that incumbent Pilch is a primary supporter of O1, the soda tax. The candidates’ complete Green Party questionnaire responses can be viewed at http://agreens.org.

Peter Maass served six years on the Albany Planning and Zoning Commission prior to being elected to the City Council in 2012. His questionnaire responses reflect a thoughtful analysis of the city budget and Albany’s place in a regional economy. He does not specifically state support for any green goals or equity in funding. He commits to multiple transport alternatives to reduce Albany’s greenhouse gas contributions. He describes a detailed green vision for the future of Solano Ave., including rail transit and dense infill housing enabling people to live easily without dependence on autos. He supports ending corporate constitutional rights and providing public funding for elections to eliminate the influence of money in politics.

Nick Pilch also served on the Planning and Zoning Commission prior to being elected to the council in 2012 and has a history of advocacy for biking and walking initiatives. As was the case in 2012, his questionnaire responses do not lay out a detailed vision. However, in combination with his voting record and history, his statements of support for pedestrian friendly improvements of Albany’s commercial district are convincing. He supports implementation of Albany’s climate action plan and has taken the Pledge to Amend (P2A). In response to this, he commits to working to restore campaign finance limits. He also pledges to revisit Albany’s living wage ordinance and introduce appropriate minimum wage legislation in upcoming negotiations.

Erik Giesen-Fields is both an attorney and architect and currently serves on the Planning and Zoning Commission, appointed by Council member Pilch. Both his Green Party questionnaire responses and campaign website are somewhat general in what they detail about their issues, and emphasize as a top priority working with the Solano Ave. Association and Albany and number member of Commerce to ensure a “thriving” commercial corridor. The vision of this commercial district is not specified, and there is no mention of green values or features. While community-based economics are a Green Party key value, an emphasis on the health of business and fiscal responsibility without attention to ecological wisdom, social justice, or personal and global responsibility seems unbalanced. Regarding environmental issues, Giesen-Fields supports implementation of Albany’s climate action plan.

We encourage readers to view his response in its entirety, to our question regarding supporting amending the U.S. constitution to overturn corporate constitutional rights and get money out of politics; here we flag two elements of that response that make us cautious. Although he states that he supports amending the constitution in this manner, he believes that it is not a ‘silver bullet’ solution to the problem of Citizens United and advocates as ‘more effective’ the appointing of justices who are willing to overturn that ruling, a strategy over which voters have no direct influence, in contrast to the constitution amendment process. Moreover, he asserts that, because he is running for local office, he will focus “most of his attention” on “making changes at the local level.” Although his expressed willingness to minimize corporate influence in local politics is laudable, in Albany’s recent history, the perspective that the City Council’s focus should remain local has been primarily expressed by those who advocate an insular attitude and have objected to the council weighing in on important national and state issues where community input can reflect a commitment to fair and sensitive treatment of the homeless and those in need of social services. We applaud her advocacy for realizing the vision of a Paul O’Curry Drop-In Center in Albany where homeless and others could get help and referrals to needed social services. Her questionnaire is alone among those received this year in critiquing the environmental harm caused by the UC-Sprouts-Assisted Living Development on San Pablo Ave. While her views on these issues are consistent with Green Party key values of social justice, ecological wisdom, and respect for diversity, it is unclear to what extent this candidate would encompass the wide range of issues a council member is called on to analyze in order to make judgments that recognize and balance the interests of all residents.

Michael Barnes was elected to the council in 2012 despite a history of divisive statements and vitriolic personal attacks in meetings and public forums. Barnes has continued to inject a negative tone into the political dialogue. As a council member, he is known for censuring dismissal of viewpoint of the public and fellow council members that differ from his own and has exhibited a pattern of substituting his personal views for facts and expert judgment. His candidate statement says nothing about specific priorities he hopes to pursue if re-elected. His history on both the Board of Education and the City Council demonstrates that he does not have the temperament or judgment needed for public service.

Treasurer No Endorsement

Kim Denton, who has served as Albany’s treasurer since 1988, is running unopposed.

School Board

Clementina Duron and Jon Raj Festin

Four candidates are running for two open seats on the Albany Unified School District Board of Education. All of the candidates bring extensive experience in education but in varying ways, so our committee examined both their responses and interests and decided to support both candidates to ensure that the education of all students is supported.

Clementina Duron has 30 years experience as a public school educator, half of that time as a bilingual teacher and the other half as principal at various levels. She earned a Master’s of Education from Harvard, having also studied at UC Berkeley and Stanford. Her responses indicate a strong alignment with Green Party values, including an emphasis on equity and environmental sustainability. Her questionnaire responses suggest she has strong ties to the community and that her experience within schools will bring consideration of the implementation of board policy to the crafting of it.

To that end, she proposes “…a task force be established at each school level that includes students, staff and administration, whose only focus would be that of providing recommendations to the Board regarding how to proceed with the policy in a way that supports the students, staff and administration, whose only focus would be that of providing recommendations to the Board regarding how to proceed with the policy in a way that supports the students.” She is certified in Community Emergency Response and has committed her career to addressing the needs of under-served students from low-income communities.

Jon Raj Festin is a former public school teacher, now running his own marketing technology firm. He was recognized for his volunteer work in San Francisco high schools. He is a gay dad with a son in elementary school in Albany. He expressed a strong interest in the possibility of the design of the new school projects being funded by Measures B and E, proposing that the environments teach sustainability, and making this a top priority. In discussing curriculum, he acknowledges the diverse ways that different children learn, and notes the benefits of collaborative, project-based learning. He states, “The key will be to help students become the best version of themselves and graduate as well rounded, resilient young adults who can calculate risks and are not afraid to make mistakes and who are ultimately engaged citizens.” His responses to our questions emphasize his commitment to leadership that aligns well with the Key Values of the Green Party.

Kim Trutane has an extensive list of volunteer service to Albany Schools, including PTA President, Writer Coach, and several Committees. She was co-chair of the successful campaign to pass Measures B and E this past June, which this committee endorses with reservations. Her questionnaire responses suggest a strong and intimate understanding of the details of AUDS business, which is admirable and at least partially why she earned the endorsements of all five of the current Board Members. However, the minutia of running the district is more the business of the Superintendent and staff, and it is the role of the Board of Education to establish policies and see that they are carried out. Trutane supports making the schools ‘net-zero-energy-ready’ (designed to an efficiency level that allows on-site renewable energy to power the building’s energy); while this is an important level of efficiency that is difficult to achieve, she falls short of committing to the important next step of including solar power so that the new schools are zero net energy as soon as possible, and that existing schools are also powered with renewable energy. Kim Trutane is a qualified and worthy candidate, but in endorsing a maximum of two candidates for this year’s Board, we are trying to maintain a stronger alignment to the Green Party. We have every confidence that if elected she will hold true to her responses, and serve admirably.

Candidates not endorsed in questionnaire response received. We note from his candidate statement that he is a lifelong Albany resident who attended Albany schools from kindergarden through high school. He teaches in the San Leandro School District and is a member of the Bargaining Team there. He volunteers and coaches here in Albany.

Measure E1 - YES Berkeley Public Schools Educational Excellence Act of 2016

This measure replaces the special parcel tax known as BSEP, Berkeley Schools Excellence Program, that was first adopted in 1986. The measure would replace this eight-year tax with a new current tax providing approximately $200 of Berkeley’s School District’s current budget and pays for one-third of all teachers, all school libraries, and the 4th through 8th grade math and science programs. It’s fair to say that Berkeley would lose a school music program without this tax. The tax is in 37 cents / square foot. If the tax is not approved, drastic cuts across the school board would become necessary. Support from the Berkeley Federation of Teachers. Requires a 2/3 vote.

Measure T1 - YES, with reservations Infrastructure & Facilities Bond

This measure would authorize the issuance of a general obligation bond in the amount of $100,000,000 to fund infrastructure improvements. Rather than designating the specific projects to be funded as has been the practice in the past, the measure promises “a robust public process through the Public Works Commission and the Parks and Waterfront Commission. Just about any repair, renovation or replacement of a public facility could be funded, including sidewalks, streets, storm drains, green infrastructure to prevent flood ing, senior centers, park improvements recreation facilities, and buildings and prefabricated low-cost temporary buildings and property taxes by $21.27 per $100,000 assessed valuation.

The City certainly needs a lot of work, and the money has to come from somewhere. Unfortunately, many of our city’s existing buildings became necessary because of erant properties. Ensuring a “robust public process” requires electing a City Council that is actually committed to one. We would also prefer a tax to a bond. 2/3 vote required.

Measure V1 - YES GANN Appropriation Limit

Every four years, the State of California requires cities to ask voters’ permission to spend tax revenue it is already collecting in the city. Funding for Homeland Security and Emergency medical services was approved decades ago by more than two-thirds of Berkeley voters. To continue collecting and spending these funds, we need to vote YES on V1. This measure would allow the City to continue collecting and spending already approved funding for Homeland Security and Emergency services.

continued on page 7
Measure W1 - YES Citizens Redistricting Commission
This is a charter amendment which would establish a Citizens Redistricting Commission (CRC) to determine city council districts after every census. The commission is modeled on the state process, and thoughtfully tries to do exactly what the proponents claim: create a process as free of politics as is possible in an inherently political process. Any Berkeley citizen who has voted in the last two elections may serve on the CRC, with some representation from neighborhoods and city contractors, to minimize political influence. The CRC will have 13 members, 8 selected randomly from each district by the City Clerk. Those 8 members will then select 5 at-large members to come from the City Council representation. Members of the CRC would be barred from running for Mayor or City Council in the next election when the seat is up, and cannot be paid City Council staff for 2 years after their service on the CRC ends.

The process for drawing district lines in the recent past was in the hands of the City Council, resulting in missed deadlines and ultimately a gerrymander intended to oust Kriss Worthington from the Council. Whatever you think of districts elections—which did not come to Berkeley as a progressive reform—Measure W1 represents a vast improvement over the corrupt process it replaces.

Measure X1 - YES Public Campaign Financing
This is a charter amendment and ordinance to establish an optional public campaign financing program for candidates for Mayor and City Council. The amendments would dedicate $400 per Berkeley resident per year from existing General Fund money to a Fair Elections Fund. Candidates who collect at least 25 contributions of $10-$25 from “natural” persons in Berkeley, totaling at least $500; agree to only accept or solicit contributions of $25 or less; and agree not to make any personal contributions or loan to their campaign that exceeds $50, would be eligible for payments from the Fund of six times the amount of contributions, up to $120,000 for Mayoral candidates and $40,000 for Council candidates. After reaching these caps, participating candidates would continue to be restricted to contributions of $50 or less.

This is a good first step toward public financing of campaigns. Candidates can opt out, but would still be subject to the existing contribution limit of $250 per person per election cycle. This matching amount is roughly what candidates need to get over the early start to a credible campaign.

Measure Y1 - YES Youth Voting
This is a charter amendment that would allow 16 and 17 year olds to vote in School Board elections. Berkeley will join a number of cities and a host of other countries and foreign cities that have lowered the voting age in various districts to allow young people to vote for those who want to represent them. San Francisco has similar measure on the ballot. Argue “early, and I vote” by a group know more about what going on with their schools than anyone else, and this is a step in the right direction.

Measure Z1 - YES Low Income Housing Authorization
The California Constitution requires the citizens of Berkeley to vote to authorize the acquisition or construction of low income housing (meaning below market rate) by any public entity before it is bought or built. This measure would authorize the construction or acquisition of an additional 500 units of low income housing without approving any specific project. Berkeley has voted to do this three times in the past, most recently in 2000, authorizing 500. Since then, Berkeley has built 421 units. The fact that it has taken the City that long to create so few units is the troubling issue raised by this measure. Vote YES, and let’s hope we’re voting again in two years.

Measure AA - YES Rent Board Ordinance
This measure amends the Rent Ordinance to increases tenant protections. The provisions of the law would delay the eviction of families with children until after the school year is over in “no fault” situations, when an owner decides to kick the family out to move in or move in a relative. It also increases the relocation fee to $15,000, extends it to all tenant household (not just low-income) forced to move out. Low-income, disabled, age 60 or older, or long-term (since 1998) tenants will receive an additional $5,000.

The measure also contains “good government” clean-up language made necessary due to changes in state law. None of these changes weaken rent control or eviction protection, or changes how the law will be administered. The Rent Control Board was established through the initiative process, any changes to the law must be approved by a simple majority of the voters. Vote YES on AA.

Measure BB - Minimum Wage (City Sponsored) - NO
Measure CC - Minimum Wage (Labor-backed Citizens’ Initiative) - YES
On September 1, the Berkeley City Council approved a new Minimum Wage Ordinance that is compromise between these two competing ballot measures, but did so after the deadline to remove them from the ballot. Both campaigns have agreed to ask people to vote against both measures. A judge has allowed them to remove the original ballot arguments in favor of the measures from the ballot pamphlet (which is why it’s blank) and replace the original arguments against identical arguments against both measures.

Before the compromise, we were recommending a NO vote on BB, the City Council’s argument, and a YES vote on CC, the citizen’s initiative supported by labor, the NAACP, and Councilmembers Anderson, Arreguin and Worthington.

How do you decide to vote on CC now has less to do with whether you like the compromise or not, and more to do with how well informed the Berkeley electorate will be on this issue. Do you trust a majority of Berkeley citizens will follow the wishes of the proponents and vote NO on both, and that they know enough (i.e., read the voter pamphlet) that neither passes without a majority of Berkeley citizens voting against it. If not, we are not honoring an agreement to which we were not a party, we are recommending a YES vote on CC. In the event they both pass, the measure with the most votes will become law.

Berkeley Mayor
Mayor – #1 and #2: Jesse Arreguin and Kris Worthington, #3: Guy “Mike” Lee (ranked, but not endorsed)
Don’t vote for Capitelli
We have the opportunity to elect the most progressive mayor in decades: Jesse Arreguin. We are also endorsing Councilmember Kris Worthington. Both candidates are asking that you vote for both of them. Either one would make a good mayor. We endorse them strongly and without reservation because of their long positive history in the progressive minority on the City Council and activism in the community.

Jesse has been the Councilmember for District 4 for the last seven years. He has been a fierce advocate for all the people, consistently advocating green and social justice policies. His top priority as mayor will be to holistically address the housing affordability crisis, including the displacement of long-term residents representing the most vulnerable, and changing the way we approach homelessness. Other priorities include: a zero-carbon city through aggressive zoning and building code changes and transit initiatives; de-militarization of the police (including our mutual aid partners); keeping Alta Bates open; a real living wage; and universal early childhood education.

Read his extensive response to our questionnaire here: https://aagreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires. In addition to the Alameda Labor Council, SEIU 1021, the Sierra Club, and all of the progressive Democratic clubs, Jesse has been endorsed by Dolores Huerta, Danny Glover and Bernie Sanders.

There are six other candidates in the race. Under Berkeley’s Instant Run-off Voting (IRV) system you can rank three: with eight total candidates in the race it is just as important who you don’t rank. Realtor Laura Capitelli is a real threat, and he is the only candidate other than Jesse Arreguin with a realistic chance of winning. He has the backing of the current developer friendly/anti-homeless city power structure. Whoever you vote for, DON’T vote for Capitelli.

Finally, we are not endorsing him, we also recomend ranking Guy “Mike” Lee third because of his principle, active and issue-based campaign focusing on basic human rights. The other candidates in the race are graduate student Greg Zuzek, labor endorsed Cambodian Bernh Wahl, Indigenous activist Zachary RunningWolf, and Naomi Pete. We know nothing about Pete, and cannot recommend any of the others.

Basically this comes down to a race between Jesse Arreguin and Laura Capitelli. IRV allows you to vote for whoever you want, in whatever order, as long as you ONLY rank those you like. If you rank Jesse anywhere and don’t rank Capitelli (DON’T!) you are effectively voting to elect a progressive/green mayor. Vote Arreguin and Worthington #1 and #2, rank Lee #3.

Berkeley City Council, District 2
#1: Nanci Armstrong-Temple, #2: Cheryl Davila, #3: Mike Moore
Nanci Armstrong-Temple and Cheryl Davila are both running as progressives to counter the centrist, developer-friendly record of incumbent Darrell Moore. Both Nanci and Cheryl are community activists who care about Diversity, Equity, and the City. Both candidates responded to our questionnaire and have articulate positions on police accountability, responsible development and affordable housing, along with anti-displacement measures that go far beyond what is currently in place.

You can read their responses to our questionnaire here: https://aagreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires. Nanci Armstrong-Temple has been sole endorsed by Berkeley City Council member and a member of the Berkeley Affordable Housing Alliance, Berkeley Tenants Union, and the Wellstone Democratic Club. Both she and Cheryl are trying to shake continued on next page
Emeryville City Offices and Measures

Berkeley City Council, District 6
#1: Fred Dodsworth
#2: Isabelle Gaston
(ranked, but not endorsed)

Fred Dodsworth and Isabelle Gaston are challenging incumbent Susan Wengraf in this most conservative of Berkeley districts.

Fred Dodsworth is a former journalist and small businessperson, a beekeeper and poet. He has lived in District 6 for more than thirty years. He has built his campaign around neighborhood protections, developer give-backs, saving Alta Bates Hospital, and bringing the community into the planning process. He supports rent-control and the tenant Rent Board slate, as well as Mayoral candidate Jesse Arreguin. We are happy to endorse him. His questionnaire responses are a delight, and you can read them here: https://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires

Isabelle Gaston is a medical writer and President of NEBA. She is running on a platform of fiscal responsibility. Rank her second, because, as Fred says, she’s not Wengraf.

District 6 is likely to win by landslides. Both incumbents have endorsed the slate. They are respectively, a community activist, an incumbent Rent Board member, and a tenants’ attorney and a housing advocate. Senator Bernie Sanders has endorsed the slate. They are both well respected, and would likely win by landslides. Both incumbents have endorsed the slate. They are respectively, a community activist, an incumbent Rent Board member, and a tenants’ attorney and a housing advocate. Senator Bernie Sanders has endorsed the slate. These are well respected, and would likely win by landslides.

Berkeley School Board

No Endorsement

Judy Appel and Beatriz Laytra-Cutler are running for re-election and have only one challenger, Abdur Sukder, who has kids in the Berkeley schools. What little we could find out about him was not encouraging, and the incumbents are likely to win by landsides. Both incumbents have endorsed Laurie Capelliti for Mayor. None of the candidates returned our questionnaire. As of this writing, perennial school board candidate Norma Harrison had begun the process to become a write-in candidate.

Berkeley Rent Board

Igor Tregub, Christina Murphy, Alejandro Soto-Vigil, and Leah Simon-Weisberg.

Vote for all 4!

The Green Party of Alameda County sponsored and participated in the Berkeley Tenants’ Convention in April, at which four candidates for the four seats on the Rent Board were selected: Christina Murphy, Alejandro Soto-Vigil, Leah Simon-Weisberg, and Igor Tregub – the Green Party slate, Cali Slate, or CA slate. This is one of the most competitive races in the Berkeley districts.

The Green Party of Alameda County sponsored and participated in the Berkeley Tenants’ Convention in April, at which four candidates for the four seats on the Rent Board were selected: Christina Murphy, Alejandro Soto-Vigil, Leah Simon-Weisberg, and Igor Tregub – the Green Party slate, Cali Slate, or CA slate. This is one of the most competitive races in the Berkeley districts.

Emeryville City Offices and Measures

Berkeley City Council, District 3
#1: Ben Bartlett
#2: Mark Coplan
#3: Al Murray

Don’t vote for Matthews.

After many years of fighting as the heart and soul of the Berkeley City Council, Councilmember Max Anderson has decided to retire. Four candidates are vying for this open seat: Ben Bartlett, Mark Coplan, Al Murray, and Deborah Matthews. Bartlett, Coplan, and Murray returned our questionnaire. Matthews did not.

You are encouraged to read their responses online here:
https://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires

Ben Bartlett is running to “defend and promote progressive values.” He is a multi-generational South Berkeley native and environmentalist, currently representing South Berkeley on the Planning Commission. His priorities include affordable housing, particularly for seniors, facing displacement of long-time residents head-on, and keeping Alta Bates hospital open. He would form an emergency response team to deal with the increasing mental health call to free up police resources. He believes he will be a consistent and dependable progressive voice and policy- driver for District 3, and a councilmember responsive to his constituents. He has been endorsed by Alameda Labor Council, People for Bernie, Berkeley Thinkers, People of Adeline, the progressive Democratic clubs, California Nurses Association, SEIU, AFSCME and Max Anderson. We recommend ranking him #1.

Mark Coplan is running “to make Berkeley a beautiful place to live, work, and visit.” He is a Vietnam veteran and was the popular long-term public Information Officer for the Berkeley schools. His priorities include new housing with affordability goals, accessory dwelling units to help seniors, a living wage, expanding community gardens, and maintaining rent control while reducing costs to small owners. Overall his policy positions are very green, but unfortunately he would consider building housing for the homeless on People’s Park, something we could never support. He is working for endorsements from community leaders on every block rather than from the political power brokers. We recommend ranking him #2.

Al Murray is running to continue many of the things his mentor Max Anderson has done for his district. His priorities include more affordable housing, particularly for seniors and those with disabilities, safer streets and neighbor- hoods, implementing the Cities Climate Action Plan, enhance sustainable transportation models in public transit, walking, cycling; and hiring responsible city staff. He is a retired US Environmental Protection Agency administrator and has served on many major federal commissions. He has very good positions on most issues. We recommend ranking him #3.

Deborah Matthews is a Planning Commissioner and former Zoning Adjustment Board member with an extensive record. Her votes are consistently, nay always, on the side of property owners and developers, often arguing for more concessions for big projects. The thought of her selling on Berkeley’s City Council leaves us absolutely cold.

Defeat Matthews! Rank Ben Bartlett #1, Mark Coplan #2, and Al Murray #3.

Berkeley City Council, District 5
Sophie Hahn

Sophie Hahn is running for the open seat in District 5, a seat traditionally held by “moderate democrats”—conservative by Berkeley standards. Her election would move the Council significantly to the left and open the door for a real green agenda. We enthusiastically endorsed her when she ran for this seat four years ago and do so again. She gave an expansive detailed response to our questionnaire such that we could in no way do it justice here.

We encourage you to read their responses online here:
https://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires

Sophie is running “to forge a dynamic future that embodies our progressive values, to ensure that Berkeley’s citizens are lifted up, not pushed out, and to put sustain- ability at the center of everything we do in Berkeley.” She grew up in District 5, and has dedicated her life to social and environmental justice. In her role as Zoning Board Com- missioner and as a citizen activist, she has been a leader responsible, green development and land use policies. She will work to create the strongest Green building code possi- ble, is a strong supporter of rent control, and would like Berkeley to adopt transit solutions modeled on Amsterdam or Copenhagen. She co-wrote the urban agriculture policy for residential areas, and has specific ideas to expand local food production. She is co-convenor of the Berkeley Zero Net Energy+ Working Group, creators of the Deep Green Building Initiative. Sophie will move affordable housing to the center of Berkeley’s housing policy, and offers a detailed and specific set of policies to address the crisis.

Highly recommended.

Berkeley City Council, District 6

Ken Bukowski, with reservations

For the two openings on the Emery School Board of Trustees the Green Party endorses the two candidates who responded to our questionnaire, which the third candidate, Cruz Vargas, did not. The salient quality of our picks is their commitment to transparency; desperately needed in Emeryville. Both Barbara Inch and Ken Bukowski have ex- pressed an interest in joining the Unified School District into either Oakland or Berkeley, a creative idea that could vastly increase educational prospects for the children in cash- and resource-strapped Emeryville.

Ken Bukowski improved the City’s Climate Change Plan, implementing the City’s Climate Action Plan. He is a committed advocate for families needing park space on Emeryville’s Parks and Recreation Committee. Her questionnaire clearly indicated that she is supportive of teachers, believes the district administration is “top heavy” and money would be better spent on employers directly serving children. We support Barbara without reservation.

School Board

Ken Bukowski

Ken Bukowski was on the other hand given praise. We watched him for years as city council member when he couldn’t seem to extract any community benefits from developers, instead putting them in the driver’s seat in Em- eriville. Also disconcerting has been Bukowski’s checkered past with FPPC rulings against him and fines never paid. In the intervening time since he lost council re-election how- ever, Bukowski has been a community member interested in issues of transparency, serving as a video chronicler of myriads of public meetings, including school board, that he graciously shares with the public without any material gain to him. This has been a great help for democratic civic engagement in Emeryville and we think perhaps it’s time to give Bukowski another chance. We support Bukowski with reservations.

Ken Bukowski was on the other hand given praise. We watched him for years as city council member when he couldn’t seem to extract any community benefits from developers, instead putting them in the driver’s seat in Emeryville. Also disconcerting has been Bukowski’s checkered past with FPPC rulings against him and fines never paid. In the intervening time since he lost council re-election however, Bukowski has been a community member interested in issues of transparency, serving as a video chronicler of myriads of public meetings, including school board, that he graciously shares with the public without any material gain to him. This has been a great help for democratic civic engagement in Emeryville and we think perhaps it’s time to give Bukowski another chance. We support Bukowski with reservations.


Fremont City Council
Cullen Tiernan and Vinnie Bacon

In the race for Fremont City Council there are two seats at stake. We don’t know Berniercet and political newcomer Cullen Tiernan well, but he seems well-aligned with our values. We are informed by go-to Greens in Fremont that Vinnie Bacon has been doing a good job. We recommend you vote for both of them. They are running grassroots campaigns, committed to working through grassroots funding, and rejecting developer/special interest money. This is the only way to push back against excessive and unsafe developments.

We regret we don’t have a stronger presence of active Greens in Alameda County’s second-most populous city, Fremont, or of the South Shore Green Team, and we are actively trying to engage more Green Party members who live in these areas and very much welcome future participation from interested individuals, so please do contact us if this is the case. As a result, we didn’t have a Fremont questionnaire to send to candidates.

Cullen Tiernan reached out to us and filled out a Berkeley City Council questionnaire. You can read it here: https://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires

Hayward City Council

Hayward Area Recreation and Park District Measure F1 - YES with reservations
Bond Measure

Measure F1 will issue $250 million in bonds for the Hayward Area Recreation and Park District (HARD) to maintain and enhance neighborhood parks, senior and community centers, children’s playgrounds and recreation facilities. The funds will also be used for renovation and development or acquisition of sites and facilities. The measure requires a 2/3 vote to pass.

This is a good measure to increase the open space and recreational opportunities available for the Hayward area. There is no statement against the ballot measure.

There is an intention to include sustainability as a principle, including solar power, minimizing water usage, and using green materials. We would like to see even more of a push for that on the website, and hope that the citizens’ oversight committee, which will manage the disbursement of the money, will make this a priority. On the whole, we think this measure will help the community build “outdoors awareness” and lead to more such development in the future.

A major reservation is the controversy over several of the events at the annual Rowell Ranch Rodeo which contradicts the values of the Green Party concerning the welfare of non-human animals. This casts a shadow over our ability to support them from getting much more funding in the future without qualification. Although technically the parks that will be developed have no connection to the rodeo itself, which is in a separate location, HARD is the umbrella organization for these activities. We would like to see the phasing out of the particularly cruel rodeo events, so that HARD will provide recreational activities consistent with ecological values including respect for nature and animals.

Another significant reservation is that the Green Party supports raising funds through direct current taxes rather than bonds paid off in the future, with interest.

Oakland School Board
continued from page 1

He will be creative around vocational training (with which he has direct experience), school gardens, recreation programs and other innovations, even while addressing large issues such as class size and the growing presence of police on campus. Likewise, he will focus great energy on programs of restorative justice and other means to resist the “school to prison pipeline.” Don will put his work in the broad context of social and economic justice. And, critically, Don will not be a rubber stamp for the current superintendent and bureaucratic regime. Hopefully, he will be part of a winning slate, backed by the Oakland Justice Coalition and the teachers’ unions, Oakland Education Association (OEA).

Measure GT - YES, with reservations
School Parcel Tax

The Oakland Unified School District Board has put forth this parcel tax with the aim of attracting and retaining school site educators, increasing access in the middle schools to arts, music and world language curriculums, and to improve the retention of students migrating from elementary to the middle schools of OUSD. Also, a goal is to increase the perception that OUSD Schools have a safe and positive environment.

The Parcel tax is for 12 years at $120 per parcel with exemptions for senior citizens and low income.

The monies accrued through the parcel tax will be allocated: 1 percent for administration, 65 percent for school based educator pay increases, and 35 percent for curriculum or safety plans in any school with a sixth, seventh, or eighth grade.

School-based educator pay is based on all OUSD employees who are represented by a union.

The District approached OEA on the issue that this revenue would increase teacher salaries by 4 percent. They told the work group that we would never win homeowners for a tax that only benefit certificated employees. And that is why all union representative employees are included in this parcel tax (the fact that classified who are our most impacted work group will receive 2.4 percent increase because of this parcel tax could make a difference).

continued on next page
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Oakland Unified School Board Director, District #1
http://www.donmaclay.org/  P.O. Box 20299, Oakland, CA, 94602 (510) 735-7361 FPPC # 1384267

Our campaign is the only one endorsed by our teachers represented by the Oakland Education Association and Councilmember Rebecca Kaplan, Dan Siegel, Alameda Labor Council, Oakland Justice Coalition, Green Party of Alameda County, Block By Block Organizing Network, and many other local leaders and independent businesses.

I believe that public education has always been, is currently, and will remain essential to American democracy. Our campaign is committed to create a public education system that will fashion a citizenry held together by a core of civic values and a collective identity regardless of creed, national origin, religion, or political preference.

Our public school system is under attack. A handful of multi-millionaires have pumped unprecedented amounts of money into efforts to privatize the public schools by promoting “charter schools” that are really voucher schools. This campaign for these pseudo-charter schools is neglecting our commitment to real public schools by replacing them with schools that are run like businesses.

In Oakland the privatization campaign is led by GO Public Schools. Their beneficial actions notwithstanding, they are a millionaire’s PAC spending an obscene amount of money to dominate our school board elections, having supported 6 of the 7 current board members. This is a school board that never respects a charter school authorization and does not hold public oversight hearings. The current school board has closed neighborhood schools and shuffle adult education calling it fiscal “stability.” Stable in the boardroom and accounting office maybe, but the schools find their support precarious and insecure.

On average, charter schools do not perform better. Oakland’s experience with charter schools, which currently enrols one of the highest percentages of students of any city in the country, reveals that the charter schools are failing to serve our students with the greatest needs and increasing racial segregation in our schools, by introducing a system of choosing a school at the expense of choices at our neighborhood schools.

On the OUSD board, I will promote regularly scheduled school board reviews of the district management of all the departments and schools, including the charter schools, in accordance with the recent recommendations of the Alameda County Grand Jury report which found oversight seriously lacking. I will not use standardized test results as the main oversight tool to evaluate schools and teachers.

I will promote elective choices at ALL of our neighborhood schools, instead of the current lottery system to choose a school outside of one’s community. Electives at local schools are essential to letting parents get the classes they need for their children. Classes such as shop, civics, Spanish, ESL, special ed, nutrition, gardening, economic literacy, sports, music and art all need to be made available at all schools instead of only at certain special schools or charter schools. Charters with a serious special mission that have shown themselves effective and desired by communities should be invited to come back into the system and be regular OUSD schools. Our schools should not only focus on college prep, but also should prepare students for adulthood as full citizens in the community and as participants in the economy.

Join me to help restore “Whole Schools” that are “Healthy Schools” and “Neighborhood Schools” in Oakland.

Oakland teachers say: “Vote for Don Maclay!”

Our campaign is the only one endorsed by our teachers represented by the Oakland Education Association and Councilmember Rebecca Kaplan, Dan Siegel, Alameda Labor Council, Oakland Justice Coalition, Green Party of Alameda County, Block By Block Organizing Network, and many other local leaders and independent businesses.

I believe that public education has always been, is currently, and will remain essential to American democracy. Our campaign is committed to create a public education system that will fashion a citizenry held together by a core of civic values and a collective identity regardless of creed, national origin, religion, or political preference.

Our public school system is under attack. A handful of multi-millionaires have pumped unprecedented amounts of money into efforts to privatize the public schools by promoting “charter schools” that are really voucher schools. This campaign for these pseudo-charter schools is neglecting our commitment to real public schools by replacing them with schools that are run like businesses.

In Oakland the privatization campaign is led by GO Public Schools. Their beneficial actions notwithstanding, they are a millionaire’s PAC spending an obscene amount of money to dominate our school board elections, having supported 6 of the 7 current board members. This is a school board that never respects a charter school authorization and does not hold public oversight hearings. The current school board has closed neighborhood schools and shuffle adult education calling it fiscal “stability.” Stable in the boardroom and accounting office maybe, but the schools find their support precarious and insecure.

On average, charter schools do not perform better. Oakland’s experience with charter schools, which currently enrols one of the highest percentages of students of any city in the country, reveals that the charter schools are failing to serve our students with the greatest needs and increasing racial segregation in our schools, by introducing a system of choosing a school at the expense of choices at our neighborhood schools.

On the OUSD board, I will promote regularly scheduled school board reviews of the district management of all the departments and schools, including the charter schools, in accordance with the recent recommendations of the Alameda County Grand Jury report which found oversight seriously lacking. I will not use standardized test results as the main oversight tool to evaluate schools and teachers.

I will promote elective choices at ALL of our neighborhood schools, instead of the current lottery system to choose a school outside of one’s community. Electives at local schools are essential to letting parents get the classes they need for their children. Classes such as shop, civics, Spanish, ESL, special ed, nutrition, gardening, economic literacy, sports, music and art all need to be made available at all schools instead of only at certain special schools or charter schools. Charters with a serious special mission that have shown themselves effective and desired by communities should be invited to come back into the system and be regular OUSD schools. Our schools should not only focus on college prep, but also should prepare students for adulthood as full citizens in the community and as participants in the economy.

Join me to help restore “Whole Schools” that are “Healthy Schools” and “Neighborhood Schools” in Oakland.
We endorse measure HH.

Reasons to approve this measure include that the tax benefits those who are most critically impacted by the housing situation in Oakland who are classified employees. Also, the expression intent is to increase electives to inspire and prepare middle school students in addition, the reality is that many parents choose charter schools because of the issue of safety and allocated monies are meant to address that issue. There is also the matter of all of any OUSD unions.

Allocations of money will only go toward students who are residents of Oakland and chartar schools who have a large population of students from outside of Oakland will not unduly benefit, so it represents Oakland tax dollars for Oakland residents. 

One question is, will requiring proof that 65 percent of the money will go toward teacher salaries increase the possibility of looking at charter school site budgets? 

Arguments opposed include that charter schools are not public schools and should not benefit from public funds. This is a run around to increase charter school seats in the district? Again, those who were at the table designing the measure were those school board members and nonprofits who are most likely to support charter schools. 

To those who say that any parcel tax that includes charter schools is automatically, it would require opposing all parcel taxes, because state law says they have to be included.

Measure HH - YES with concerns

Soda Tax

You have probably already received several expensive glossy mailers rephrasing the Oakland proposed tax on sugar-sweetened beverages (such as soda) to a “grocery tax” which would raise the prices you pay for food and put small businesses out of business. The tax proposes “a penny-per-ounce revenue stream that could raise up to $12 million per year to aid in efforts to fight obesity.” This measure was placed on the November ballot by a unanimous vote of the Oakland City Council. “Oakland would join a growing number of municipalities—likely the first Bay Area city to adopt such a tax. Sales of soda and other sugary beverages have fallen in Berkeley, a result of not only the higher cost of the drinks but also increased education around the health detriments of “sugar,” according to the SF Chronicle article of 5/14/16. There is an exemption for small businesses. San Francisco and Albany will also be voting on similar measures in November.

“If voters approve the tax, the money raised would go into the city’s general fund, and officials said the idea is to earmark it to pay for health and wellness programs in the community and in schools. The measure requires the city to create an advisory board to recommend how to spend the money. “Because the money raised would go into the General Fund, only a majority vote is needed to pass the tax.”

This measure seeks to stop or curtail the use of sugary drinks. While this is a worthy desire, our concern is that this measure will diminish the retail cost (raise the prices of the sugary drinks) and doesn’t go far enough in promoting healthy and healthy food choices in poor neighborhoods. The goal ought to be to ensure access to real food for all communities. We call for actions to provide the end of food deserts in our city, and allow all Oaklanders access to non-GMO foods, juices, vegetables, etc. This is a basic and powerful step in allowing the building blocks of health for all to be in place. While it may not render unhealthy and addictive foods more expensive. Despite these concerns we endorse measure HH.

Oakland Measure JJ - YES Just Cause Eviction and Rent Law Amendment

Measure JJ will strengthen Oakland’s current Rent Law and protect many renters from displacement, while assuring rental owners a fair return. JJ was placed on the November ballot by the Oakland Association for Non-Profit Housing developers. The measure seeks to prohibit any rent increases, requires that the renter is forced to accept whatever the owner demands… or more.

Just Cause eviction protection will be extended to rental units built after 1996. Currently only units built before October 1980 are covered. Measure JJ will extend protections against arbitrary eviction to approximately 12,000 renter-occupied rental units in Oakland.

Reasons to approve this measure include that the tax benefits those who are most critically impacted by the housing situation in Oakland who are classified employees. Also, the expression intent is to increase electives to inspire and prepare middle school students in addition, the reality is that many parents choose charter schools because of the issue of safety and allocated monies are meant to address that issue. There is also the matter of all of any OUSD unions.

Allocations of money will only go toward students who are residents of Oakland and chartar schools who have a large population of students from outside of Oakland will not unduly benefit, so it represents Oakland tax dollars for Oakland residents. 

One question is, will requiring proof that 65 percent of the money will go toward teacher salaries increase the possibility of looking at charter school site budgets? 

Arguments opposed include that charter schools are not public schools and should not benefit from public funds. This is a run around to increase charter school seats in the district? Again, those who were at the table designing the measure were those school board members and nonprofits who are most likely to support charter schools. 

To those who say that any parcel tax that includes charter schools is automatically, it would require opposing all parcel taxes, because state law says they have to be included.

Measure JJ - YES with concerns

Soda Tax

You have probably already received several expensive glossy mailers rephrasing the Oakland proposed tax on sugar-sweetened beverages (such as soda) to a “grocery tax” which would raise the prices you pay for food and put small businesses out of business. The tax proposes “a penny-per-ounce revenue stream that could raise up to $12 million per year to aid in efforts to fight obesity.” This measure was placed on the November ballot by a unanimous vote of the Oakland City Council. “Oakland would join a growing number of municipalities—likely the first Bay Area city to adopt such a tax. Sales of soda and other sugary beverages have fallen in Berkeley, a result of not only the higher cost of the drinks but also increased education around the health detriments of “sugar,” according to the SF Chronicle article of 5/14/16. There is an exemption for small businesses. San Francisco and Albany will also be voting on similar measures in November.

“If voters approve the tax, the money raised would go into the city’s general fund, and officials said the idea is to earmark it to pay for health and wellness programs in the community and in schools. The measure requires the city to create an advisory board to recommend how to spend the money. “Because the money raised would go into the General Fund, only a majority vote is needed to pass the tax.”

This measure seeks to stop or curtail the use of sugary drinks. While this is a worthy desire, our concern is that this measure will diminish the retail cost (raise the prices of the sugary drinks) and doesn’t go far enough in promoting healthy and healthy food choices in poor neighborhoods. The goal ought to be to ensure access to real food for all communities. We call for actions to provide the end of food deserts in our city, and allow all Oaklanders access to non-GMO foods, juices, vegetables, etc. This is a basic and powerful step in allowing the building blocks of health for all to be in place. While it may not render unhealthy and addictive foods more expensive. Despite these concerns we endorse measure HH.

Oakland Measure JJ - YES Just Cause Eviction and Rent Law Amendment

Measure JJ will strengthen Oakland’s current Rent Law and protect many renters from displacement, while assuring rental owners a fair return. JJ was placed on the November ballot by the Oakland Association for Non-Profit Housing developers. The measure seeks to prohibit any rent increases, requires that the renter is forced to accept whatever the owner demands… or more.

Just Cause eviction protection will be extended to rental units built after 1996. Currently only units built before October 1980 are covered. Measure JJ will extend protections against arbitrary eviction to approximately 12,000 renter-occupied rental units in Oakland.

Reasons to approve this measure include that the tax benefits those who are most critically impacted by the housing situation in Oakland who are classified employees. Also, the expression intent is to increase electives to inspire and prepare middle school students in addition, the reality is that many parents choose charter schools because of the issue of safety and allocated monies are meant to address that issue. There is also the matter of all of any OUSD unions.

Allocations of money will only go toward students who are residents of Oakland and chartar schools who have a large population of students from outside of Oakland will not unduly benefit, so it represents Oakland tax dollars for Oakland residents. 

One question is, will requiring proof that 65 percent of the money will go toward teacher salaries increase the possibility of looking at charter school site budgets? 

Arguments opposed include that charter schools are not public schools and should not benefit from public funds. This is a run around to increase charter school seats in the district? Again, those who were at the table designing the measure were those school board members and nonprofits who are most likely to support charter schools. 

To those who say that any parcel tax that includes charter schools is automatically, it would require opposing all parcel taxes, because state law says they have to be included.

Measure JJ - YES with concerns

Soda Tax

You have probably already received several expensive glossy mailers rephrasing the Oakland proposed tax on sugar-sweetened beverages (such as soda) to a “grocery tax” which would raise the prices you pay for food and put small businesses out of business. The tax proposes “a penny-per-ounce revenue stream that could raise up to $12 million per year to aid in efforts to fight obesity.” This measure was placed on the November ballot by a unanimous vote of the Oakland City Council. “Oakland would join a growing number of municipalities—likely the first Bay Area city to adopt such a tax. Sales of soda and other sugary beverages have fallen in Berkeley, a result of not only the higher cost of the drinks but also increased education around the health detriments of “sugar,” according to the SF Chronicle article of 5/14/16. There is an exemption for small businesses. San Francisco and Albany will also be voting on similar measures in November.

“If voters approve the tax, the money raised would go into the city’s general fund, and officials said the idea is to earmark it to pay for health and wellness programs in the community and in schools. The measure requires the city to create an advisory board to recommend how to spend the money. “Because the money raised would go into the General Fund, only a majority vote is needed to pass the tax.”

This measure seeks to stop or curtail the use of sugary drinks. While this is a worthy desire, our concern is that this measure will diminish the retail cost (raise the prices of the sugary drinks) and doesn’t go far enough in promoting healthy and healthy food choices in poor neighborhoods. The goal ought to be to ensure access to real food for all communities. We call for actions to provide the end of food deserts in our city, and allow all Oaklanders access to non-GMO foods, juices, vegetables, etc. This is a basic and powerful step in allowing the building blocks of health for all to be in place. While it may not render unhealthy and addictive foods more expensive. Despite these concerns we endorse measure HH.
interest rates, the demand and the length of the payback, the taxpayer for Oakland would be on the hook for 2 to 3 times the original amount.

The city has specifically included language that this expenditure must include "how the projects address social and geographic disparities, how it is designed to under- serve populations and in geographic areas of greatest need." Curiously, in the "whereas" portion of the supporting resolution, the Council specifically mentions the contentious Specific Area Plans (SAPs) and their with the new Environmental Impact Reports. Oakland has created at least a dozen SAPs that cover more than one-third of the city. Most of it in the rich, white, and los Angeles, and has an extensive program of urban renewal that is not new to her. As such, she is quite adept at politics. Therefore, with Oakland’s political history, we can see why she is such an easy choice for mayor of this city.

Vote NO and pressure the legislature to tax the wealthy with a progressive method available at the state level and then distribute that money to the localities.

Oakland Measure LL - No Endorsement Police Commission and Review Agency

This has been a difficult decision.

The goal of having an empowered police commission reflects both the struggles nationally around police violence/ accountability and the reality that Oakland faces today, which revolves around matters of process and substance: some concessions can be accepted if they reflect the power of the grassroots. Here the alteration of the demands on how the police can function and their accountability must be achieved.

Oakland Measure LL and Renter Protection Act (Measure JJ).

The city has specifically included language that this measure is for "a 10K plan of truly affordable housing." He supports a municipal bank, restorative justice, policing reforms, job skills training, and other people-centered measures. He is "toughly involved in the system" and has spent most of his adult life in the building trades.

Rank #2 — Rebecca Kaplan is running for re-election "to bring more social equity, environmental justice, non- profitability, and a more diverse police force, and police and the general public in Oakland and ACCE." In the past, Kaplan was not responsive to community efforts to meet with her. She has had few allies on the City Council. But upon winning, she has made more allies now. She has been running for re-election during that time, of course, and we hope that, if she wins another term, she will continue to be her new self. She would like to see a shift from a "top-down" approach to an approach on residential property when the property is not retained for at least a year or two, and to have progressive rates for real estate transfer taxes. Kaplan, an out Lesbian, is a strong supporter of female candidates and women in the workforce. (by Alameda County mayors) to the Bay Area Quality Management District Board (BAAAQMD), which hasn't had a representative from Oakland in 25 years, and where she is playing an important role in climate justice. Kaplan was an early supporter of No Coal in Oakland, spearheaded the effort to get the Measure JJ (Protect Oakland Renters) to the ballot and made sure that the protection from the Police Commission consists of all community members, rather than some appointed by the Mayor. This is one of the reasons that Mayor Schaaf is supporting another candidate in this race.

Though Mayor Libby Schaaf is not running in the at-large race, her footprints are there: she wants the incumbent, Rebecca Kaplan’s (by Oakland Community Coalition) choice, Noni Session to run. If elected, Moore likely will be the voice of developers and continue the gentrification and privatization of the city. Until recently, Moore served as Special Junior Senator to Oakland, chairing the government affairs and finance committee, resigning to run for the at-large council seat. Moore is motivated to run to correct what she says is a lack of partnership between the Council and the Mayor. Moore is African American and lives in West Oakland. She has made her commitment to the importance of diversity to Oakland. She has leadership roles in several LGBTQ and African American groups, as well as local and national Democratic Party organizations. As a long time, Moore says she favors rent control, but she is not supporting Measure JJ (Protect Oakland Renters). She wants to continue her work with youth. In her campaign, Moore says, “I will not accept money from anyone whose values conflict with my own.” Since she lists a prominent Oakland developer and a business executive among supporters, we assume she accepts corporate contributions. Greens are supporting School Board candidate Matt McElhaney. (by Oakland Justice Coalition) to avoid significant political backlash. As such, she opted to be a co-author of Civilian Police Commission (Measure LL) and Renter Protection Act (Measure JJ).

City Council At-Large

City Council At-Large #1: Matt Hummel

The incumbent, Rebecca Kaplan, has served two 4-year terms on the Council and is running for a third term as the 1 council seat. Vote for Dan Kalb.

City Council District 3

Noni Session impressed us with her responses to our questionnaire. She displays a refreshing willingness to approve of concepts and principals which were new to her. Our question 12 explains what Public Banking is, and asks whether the candidate would introduce, co-sponsor and/ or support a Public Bank of Oakland. Her answer is “Yes” and a long-explained "Public Banking is a difficult model toward which I would like to move Oakland." It is rare to find a candidate so willing to accept an idea that is new to her.

Similarly, our question 13 concerns local payday lenders, and we inform the candidate that there is one nonprofit check cashing and payday lending storefront in the city, and ask whether the candidate would introduce, co-sponsor and/ or support a Public Bank of Oakland. Her answer is "Yes" and a long-explained "I believe it to be a difficult model toward which I would like to move Oakland." It is rare to find a candidate so willing to accept an idea that is new to her.

City Council District 1

Dan Kalb, with reservations

In his first term, Dan Kalb has proven to be a solid advocate for progressive policies. He has championed major achievements such as setting aside funds for affordable housing, supporting the Tenancy Protection Ordinance, stopping coal in the Anchorage, and authoring the Civilian Police Commission (Measure LL) ballot measure. A reservation is that Dan has a tendency to feel he knows the most about an issue, an assertion that is somewhat true. Dan Kalb’s challenger, Kevin Corbett believes that Oakland’s primary issues are “Crime, inefficiency and lack of government responsiveness.” However, he fails to provide a specific plan, which would be helpful to better understand these issues. On key issues of importance to Oakland, he provides little to no insight on his position except his opposition to Civilian Police Commission (Measure LL).

Dan Kalb is the unequivocal superior choice for District council seat. Vote for Dan Kalb.
with the Democratic Party. My closest ideological alignment is with the Green Party and the ten key values. I hope to work with the Green Party as much as possible for guidance and accountability for enacting best practices for the people of Oakland.”

Although Session has been active in social justice causes, she has had little experience in large scale and complex enterprises. This lack of experience may present a risk to her success as a councilmember. However, given McElhaney’s track record, we endorse Novi Session for the District 3 Council seat.

City Council, District 5
Noel Gallo, with reservations

Noel Gallo is the incumbent for the District 5 seat. Although he wants to increase the number of sworn police officers, he has been a consistent defender of the Oakland Police Department and an opponent of most progressive policy issues such as opposing charters and the massive testing regime; rather she sees the position as integrally linked to parent/community empowerment. Wiginton identifies herself as “a voice of the people.” While fairly new to school district politics, she is rooted in the Black community. She was impressive in her interview with the Labor Council and is endorsed by the OEA and the Oakland Justice Coalition.

While gender and race are factors, the key issue is her commitment to community involvement and a linkage between public education and the broader sense of social justice.

School Board, District 5
#1: Mike Hutchinson
#2: Roseann Torres

Don’t vote for Trenado

The School Board race in District 5 has some parallels with the one in District 3: there are multiple candidates and the OEA Public School Teachers are attempting to endorse one.

What is impressive is that the candidate named for our endorsement is far and away the most knowledgeable and familiar with any of the candidates in this race. Mike Hutchinson ran in 2012 and did reasonably well, garnering 45 percent of the vote. He is involved both locally and nationally in resistance to the neo-liberal deforestation and underfunding of public education philanthropists such as the Oakland Public Education Fund inside and out and frequently speaks on such issues at the school board meetings. Moreover, he is involved with national networks such as JourneyJustice, a largely people of color group fighting austerity and education reforms.

But Mike is also involved with local activism. He was active in the fight to stop the closure of Lakeshore school and other schools such as Maxwell Park, where he has worked. He has no problem directly confronting the superintendent.

Mike is endorsed by the OEA Public School Teachers (he is also ranking second Torres). He works closely with forces within the union, such as Class Struggle. Mike stresses his inclusive approach not just a group of urban public school professionals and community members, but also for diverse communities in the expression of the candidates. In his interview with the Labor Council, he included students and community members in his endorsement.

In contrast, the incumbent Hodge has extensive experience in Oakland and OUSD She has been a community development consultant and has been active in West Oakland for two decades. She has served with the West Oakland Education Task Force, seeking partnerships between the school district, community groups, and small business organizations. She has worked with low income youth. She has served on the School Board since 2008 and was Vice President for several years. So far, this does not present the danger in returning Hodge to office.

Jumoke Hodge has been at the center of the pro-charter forces in the Oakland schools. While she speaks out on some progressive issues, her record contains many problems. For more teachers of color, she has accepted and even supported school closures in her district, along with the expansion of charters. She was frequently called the “Trojan horse” by teachers, activists at school board meetings. She is a strong supporter of Great Oakland (GO) Public Schools and their pro-charter, privatizing agenda; they boosted her in the last election and again this year, according to City Email. Mayor Libby Schaaf and pro status quo Board members, James Harris and Jody London, both of whom we oppose.

This leaves us with two more positive alternatives. Ben Lang is former teacher and current staff at the school board. He has been working with the community to stop the building of a polluting crematorium in East Oakland. He is a self-defined revolutionary, and a member of the All African People’s Revolutionary Party. He also has been endorsed by the Oakland Justice Coalition. He would speak truth to power.

City Attorney
No Endorsement

Incumbent City Attorney Parker is the only candidate on the ballot. Four years ago, when we opposed Parker’s lone opponent, we wrote that Parker needed to be further away from the “business-as-usual” Democratic Party machine politics which continue to drag Oak- land down, so we’re not able to give our endorsement”. Unfortunately, Parker is still stuck in “business-as-usual” mode. We’re not able to give our endorsement this year either. While she has done some good things, such as filing lawsuits to help tenants and immigrants, and to fight sex trafficking, she’s been very weak on police accountability. In fact, last spring a report commissioned by federal Judge Thelton Henderson was released which particularly criticized the City Attorney’s office on the issue. The East Bay Express wrote “Parker repeatedly failed to prepare for police arbitration cases...repeatedly waited until the last minute to assign private attorneys to handle police misconduct cases” and, “repeatedly failed to hire a qualified staff attorney to prepare for police misconduct cases.” And in July of this year, the Coalition for Police Accountability, as reported by local activist Pamela Drake, announced that Parker had advised the City Council to gut the independent police commission charter amendment. So maybe that’s why Parker avoided giving any direct answer to us, when we asked her in our question- ing about what the city’s rising police accountability should have. Unless she greatly improves her performance over the next year or two, and especially in regards to police accountability, it looks like it’ll be time to find someone else to be our City Attorney.

School Board - District 3
#1: Kharyshi Wiginton
#2: Ben Lang, with reservations

Don’t vote for Hodge

This race involves four candidates, including the incumbent, Jumoke Hinton Hodge. newcomer Lucky Narain, and former candidate Ben Lang. District 3 includes the bulk of West Oakland, which historically has been the center of the African American community and a community that has a property of very affordable housing. It also has been heavily impacted by de-industrialization (as has East Oakland). Thus, it is not surprising that three of the four candidates are people of color.

Lucky Narain is new to Oakland (living here for three years), with little involvement in any community organizations. She acknowledges that her incentive to run for local office is that her husband works for the Army as a legal advisor, and was previously with the U.S. Department of Agriculture. She favors growing cooperation within the business community, and of shifting the blame and awareness of issues facing students is an achieving greater work experience.

In contrast, the incumbent Hodge has extensive experience in Oakland and OUSD She has been a community development consultant and has been active in West Oakland for two decades. She has served with the West Oakland Education Task Force, seeking partnerships between the school district, community groups, and small business organizations. She has worked with low income youth. She has served on the School Board since 2008 and was Vice President for several years. So far, this does not present the danger in returning Hodge to office.

Jumoke Hodge has been at the center of the pro-charter forces in the Oakland schools. While she speaks out on some progressive issues, her record contains many problems. For more teachers of color, she has accepted and even supported school closures in her district, along with the expansion of charters. She was frequently called the “Trojan horse” by teachers, activists at school board meetings. She is a strong supporter of Great Oakland (GO) Public Schools and their pro-charter, privatizing agenda; they boosted her in the last election and again this year, according to City Email. Mayor Libby Schaaf and pro status quo Board members, James Harris and Jody London, both of whom we oppose.

This leaves us with two more positive alternatives. Ben Lang is former teacher and current staff at the school board. He has been working with the community to stop the building of a polluting crematorium in East Oakland. He is a self-defined revolutionary, and a member of the All African People’s Revolutionary Party. He also has been endorsed by the Oakland Justice Coalition. He would speak truth to power.
vantage in a District which includes the Fruitvale, Hutchin- 
on hopelessly has the energy, insights and activism to pull off a victory. My way to wish in a add a note to voting to “Stop GO.”

Chris Jackson

This is one of the most obvious choices in the Oakland electoral races. The incumbent James Harris was first elected in 2009, is a Founding board member Alice Spearman, in one of the most depresse, deindustrialized areas of Oakland, especially the flatland community. Harris grew up in the community and has been a parent and edu-
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A C Transit, Ward 2

Greg Harper, with reservations

Ward 2 consists of Emeryville, Piedmont and portions of Oakland and Berkeley.

Greg Harper has served on the board since 2000 and deserves to be re-elected. He continues to have the most important of the three candidates. He is, in fact, usually the only board member who pays attention to the budget and asks probing questions about it.

He has served as president for a number of years, and most importantly, did so after the Van Hool busses, which brought down an incompetent General Manager. He helped right the ship with the new professional General Manager.

Harper is the only member of the board who has served in an elected office before his election to A C Transit. He was Mayor of Emeryville. He is also the only one with some technical background; he has a degree in electrical engineering.

He serves as A C Transit’s representative on the Trans-

Bay Area Bay Area Joint Powers Authority (TBJA) Board of Directors and is now its Chair. The TBJA is responsible for the design, construction and maintenance of the regional intermodal Transbay Transit Center in San Francisco.

The TBJA Board of Directors describes some of his background thus, “A principal in a local law firm, Director Harper is active in regional civic affairs and has served on the Regional Planning Committee of the Association of Bay Area Governments. He also has served on public bodies including the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. Alameda County has also served on the Board of Directors for the Bay Area Task Force for Water Transit in the Bay Area. Director Harper also served two Bachelor’s Degrees at the University of Illinois and his Juris Doctor Degree from Hastings College of the Law.”

Our reservation with Harper is that he is not consistently progressive. For example, in the Berkeley Mayor’s race, he has endorsed Captelli, who has opposed the anti-housing debt, pro-developer city power structure. While Harper is good on A C Transit issues, he is sometimes disappointing in other areas.

The opponent, Russ Tillman, a former engineer, ad-

mits he rarely rides buses, but one of his major concerns is minor location changes to some bus stops near his home. His lack of bus riding experience does not stop him from advocating for a number of impractical changes, including no fare bus riding. He does have one proposal on his website (abafortfuture.org) which he calls a “virtual bus lane” consisting of a bulb-out at bus stops. A C Transit is really planning those for some of their route improvements.

A C Transit, Ward 2

Dollene Jones, with reservations

The 18-year incumbent, Chris Peoples, has done a lot to improve A C Transit. As he delineates in his questionnaire, he has fought for the riders in the placement of bus stops and shelters, implemented free and reduced priced tickets for youth, expanded bus service to schools and to outlying areas, and created progressive Park and Ride lots. He himself has not had a car in 16 years so he sees A C Transit from the perspective of the average rider.

However, Peoples was, and continues to be, a major proponent of the extremely controversial Belgian-made Van Hool busses. These are considerably more expensive than American-made bus, for features such as low-step-
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BART Board, District 5

John McPartland

This race is between the incumbent, John McPartland, and one challenger, Jennifer Hooterman. There’s not a lot to say about John, other than he’s been re-elected and has been endorsed in past elections by the employees who work at BART. He was a former employee in the Safety Department and appears to prioritize those issues. The BART Board has become more politicized, with some candidates throwing more dirt and taking anti-labor stands or other positions to make themselves more attractive, but John has refrained from any of that. On a Board that sometimes focuses on developers and contractors, he does not pander to any constituency. Jennifer Hooterman is a former mayor of Pleasanton. Her base is in the more conservative areas of the District, and some of her positions are inconsistent with more popular conservative ideas. Electing directors more sympathetic to conservative and anti-labor ideals could move BART in the wrong direction. We endorse John McPartland for another term.

BART Board, District 7

Lateefah Simon

BART Board of Directors races are plurality elections, meaning many candidates can run, and the highest vote-getter wins, regardless of whether it’s a majority of those voting or not. For candidates running, meaning the two minor candidates could have an effect in a close election. The two minor candidates are the incumbent Zachary Mallett and Lateefah Simon. The incumbent was elected with mostly contractor money and has since been very anti-labor, and has shown a willingness to take extreme positions to exacerbate the problems that shut down the Bay Area in 2013. He did not return our questionnaire.

Lateefah Simon is the main challenger. She has raised a record amount of money for a BART race, but has refused to take money from contractors or big business. She has a long list of progressive endorsements, including politicians from Gavin Newsom and Kamala Harris to Gayle McLaughlin, Jovanka Beckles, and Jesse Arreguin. Lateefah Simon is endorsed by the Alameda (County), Contra Costa, and San Francisco Labor Councils, ATU Local 1555 (BART work- ers), SEIU Local 1021, and more unions. She is dependent on public transit and is a strong leader in the community.

The other two challengers show very little basic understanding of BART or its issues. Will Roscoe suggests BART could be improved by removing the trains and putting cars on the trackways. Roland Emerson answered many of our questions by stating he needs to do more research. Both state they have no endorsements and no campaign funds. We endorse Lateefah Simon.

East Bay Regional Park Board Director, Ward 2

Dee Rosario

There are four candidates for this position, and all of them returned questionnaires with substantial answers, which are available on our website and all worth reading for those concerned about the issues at stake in the election to this position. Although candidate John Roberts addressed some environmental issues, he focused more on the financial ones involved with District management. Kent Fickett has some great values that we much resonated with, for example wanting to convert the Concord Naval Weapons Station into a park with good facilities and trails (swords to plowshares, indeed)!

Further, we found in another interview online other good priorities that he has, such as “getting electric car charging stations installed at major parking areas” and a desire to have the Crabot gun club down sooner than it actually was. But of the four, we found that we resonated more with answers from Audree V. Jones-Taylor and Dee Rosario, who we think would both serve Ward 2 in a very progressive capacity.

In particular, we felt most at home with Rosario’s “progressive and Green Party value-focused answers. He has a very large amount of experience at the park system, which will hold him in good stead in making future decisions. Rosario said, “I want to see the Park District become not only the largest land owner in the East Bay, but an environmental leader, dedicated to enhancing the environment by maximizing educational opportunities, conserving natural resources, incorporating alternative energy sources, reducing its greenhouse gas footprint, recycling, and restoring areas damaged by human activity.” He also made this interesting point (among many): “parking lots should be well thought out, using permeable surfaces to incorporate bio-swales and rain gardens.”

We give Dee Rosario our endorsement for this position.

East Bay Regional Park Board Director, Ward 4

Daniel Chesmore

There are three candidates for this position, all of whom returned questionnaires to us. Retired park district equipment operator Oris Sanders replies were quite minimal and gave us little to go on.

Former State Senate Majority Leader Ellen Corbett answered in much detail in very reasonable and balanced ways on most issues (see her response in full on our website), and inspired us with how she described how she was spurred to be an environmental advocate by the time she spent in the parks when she was young. Corbett is likely the prohibitive favorite with her high level of name recognition in this area. She will likely do a decent job of balancing the environmental issues involved with grazing and development pressures that constantly beset the Park District, and if she wins, we sincerely hope she will pay heed to the positions and priorities expressed by her opponent Chesmore, discussed below.

However, our endorsement will go with Daniel Chesmore, Senior Financial Analyst at Planned Parenthood and Board Treasurer of Community Learning Center Schools in Alameda. He is far away and most the progressive leaning of all three candidates. In his response to us, he reiterated his concern about climate change repeatedly, discussed his credentials as a recent UC Berkeley grad who “advocated for food justice, fighting carbon emissions, and seeking efficient ways of reducing waste” (as well as in non-directly environmental issues such as civil rights, homophobia, education equality).

Chesmore further discusses other current specific issues such as preventing “the use of Parks’ land from becoming terrain for off-road vehicles,” the issue of lead contamination from years of shooting at the Chabot Gun Club, using UV lighting to potentially prevent more bird kills in the Altamont Pass. There is much more worth reading in his answers (to be found in full on our website), and he is clearly seeking to work closely with the Green Party in the future should she be elected. We give Daniel Chesmore a strong endorsement in this race.

Alameda County Measure

Alameda County Measure A1 - No Endorsement

Housing Bond

If it weren’t for the financialization of housing—the rent-seeking of the wealthy—smaller, local builders could better provide the affordable housing that is so needed. A1 appears to have been “sponsored” by the county staff and quickly run through the stakeholder process.

See the general note about bonds. Depending on interest rates, demand, and the length of payback, taxpayers could be on the hook for thrice the original amount.

The staff person shepherding A1 appeared genuine. The law limits how the taxes can be used. What was proposed in the stakeholder buy-in meetings appeared decent:

• for Homeowner programs: $120 Million
• Down Payment Assistance Loan Program: $50mil, target 80-120 percent AMI
• Home Repair Housing Program: $25mil, wage limit 80 percent AMI
• Home Preservation Loan Program: $45mil, wage limit 80 percent AMI
• for Rental Housing Programs: $460 Million
• Rental Housing Development: $425mil, most at 30-60 percent AMI with a portion up to 80 percent
• for Land & Opportunity Fund: $35mil, to possibly acquire apartment buildings on the market
• for water & sewer improvements

(* reference household:
1 to 4 persons: 30 percent AMI = $22k to $30k
1 to 4 persons: 40 percent AMI = $35k to $75k
120 percent AMI = $82k to $117k)

Issues: 1) Estimates of spending are not delineated. Programs, spending, and actual projects will be presented to the Board of Supervisors IF AND AFTER A1 passes. Unless the delineations are presented in the ballot booklet, do NOT vote for this blank check. The citizens’ Oversight Board only has to verify that the spending doesn’t exceed the $580 million cap.

2) The County stated that this money will stay in the county. Yes, but a majority MAY be spent on the now-standard “transit-oriented development,” massive stack & pack, modern tenements that provide larger profits for big development groups and their financiers who often hire general contractors who hire subs who travel the West to work on these projects. Little of the money may circulate within the county for local products or local workers.

3) The homeless are mentioned, but the County was recently caught using administrative measures to avoid giving the full, yet meager, general assistance funds that the homeless are entitled to, paying only about half, so trust is low.

4) Renter activists did advocate for the Supervisors to create two programs in unincorporated areas: rent stabilization to slow displacement; and, to use the only non-regressive method available at the local level—a housing impact fee—to create housing for lower wage people.

In sum, although A1 is generally good and most progressives support it, the poor only get crumbs and it doesn’t provide enough help to our low-income tenants. If we intend to attend the future Supervisors’ meetings to advo-cate, vote yes. If not, vote no.

Green Sundays

Green Sunday forums are usually held on the second Sunday of every month. Join other Greens to discuss important and sometimes controversial topics, hear guest speakers, and participate in planning a Green future.

When: Second Sunday of the month, 5:00-6:30pm
Where: Nielby-Proctor Library, 6501 Telegraph Ave., Oakland (between Alcatraz and 65th St.)
Wheelchair accessible.
Info at: http://groups.yahoo.com/group/AnnouncementsGPGC
Proposition 51 - NO
School Bonds, K-12 and Community College Limits
Developer Fees

Unlike Prop. 55, which would raise funds with taxes largely targeting the operation of public education, Prop. 51 is a bond issue aimed at education facilities. Such a project generally comes in this form, and we of course, generally have reservations of such a pro-banking, regressive means of generating funds. Additionally in this case, despite its seemingly benign goal, it is actually a project of developers, trying for real estate gains.

That said, this measure would provide $9 billion, sup posedly for school districts with the greatest need. Of the total, $6 billion would target K-12 construction and modernization projects, with $2 billion for community colleges and an additional $1 billion for career technical education and charter schools. This last item further justifies a negatives position.

It should be noted that it would cost the taxpayers $17.6 billion, nearly double the expenditures involved. Further, neither state teacher union federations (CFT and CTA) have endorsed it, and even Governor Brown says it “squanders funds that would be far better spent in low income communities.” The chief funders and endorsers are a variety of pro-real estate and construction groups, such as the Coalition for Adequate School Housing.

Proposition 52 - YES, with reservations
State Fees on Hospitals, Federal Medi-Cal Matching Funds

Prop. 52 increases required vote-to-two-thirds for the Legislature to amend an existing law that imposes fees on hospitals (for purpose of obtaining federal Medi-Cal matching funds) that otherwise those fees and federal matching funds to hospital-provided Medi-Cal health care services, to uncompensated care provided by hospitals to uninsured patients, and to emergency room patients general coverage.

This proposition protects the funds collected by the fee from the hospitals from being used for any other general fund purpose. Some of us are opposed to restricted funds for certain programs, but when the funds were collected to specifically address a certain human service area (as opposed to an income tax to fund the total budget) it is less offensive to set a limit on how the legislature will use the funds.

The only statement of opposition we could find is SEIU and the opposition is only on principle, not against the purposes of the measure. Supporters of Prop. 52 include labor unions, business groups and members of both political parties. But one union representing hospital workers, the Service Employees International Union-United Healthcare Workers (SEIU-UHW), says it’s a “money grab” by the hospitals. It says everybody… these tax dol lars are not the property of the people of California, but they belong only to the private hospital industry,” said David Kieffer, SEIU-UHW’s director of governmental relations.

Kieffer said SEIU-UHW supports the arrangement in principle but that the legislature is the most appropriate venue for deciding how to use the money raised. Lawmak ers can respond to an evolving health care system, but if Californians vote directly on the hospital proposal, their decision would be harder to undo later, he said.

Even the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association has not opposed Prop. 52.

Proponents include the California Teachers Association, California Medical Association, California Hospital Association, Solano County Supervisors, and the California Democratic Party. Top donors supporting the measure (as of April 2016) included California Health Foundation and Trust, Dignity Health, Sutter Health, Children’s Hospital Los Angeles and many other medical centers and hospi tals.

Our concerns with this measure, despite its socially constructive goals for youth, seniors and low income people, revolves around the role of the California Hospital Association, not just regarding financial support for the campaign but also regarding the money going into it, including the private sector, linked to this federal funding, and regarding adequate accountability for the moneys. That said, we still believe it is a positive program in our non-single-payer world.

Proposition 53 - NO
Revenue Bonds Requiring Statewide Voter Approval

“A yes” vote on the California Public Vote on Bonds Initiative would approve a constitutional amendment requiring voter approval before the state could issue more than $2 billion in public purpose revenue bonds that would require an increase in taxes or fees for repayment.

“A no” vote would be a vote against the voter approval requirement and in favor of continuing to allow the state to issue new debt without voter approval.

While some bonds do appear on California ballots for voter approval, bonds paid for out of state revenue are not required to be voted on by the electorate.

Supporters refer to it as the “No Blank Checks Initiative.” The primary financial supporters are Dean and Joan Coropassari. Other political supporters include the Howard Jarvis Campaign, opponents are a broad, bipartisan coalition of business, labor, and government that includes Governor Jerry Brown, California Democratic Party, California Chamber of Commerce, State Building and Construction Trades Council, and League of California Cities.

The effort to qualify Prop. 53 for the California bal lot was funded entirely by the Coropassari ($4.5 million). Because of this, it could be viewed as a vanity initiative promoted by one wealthy farmer couple. Dean Coropassari’s stated motive is to control state debt.

Despite though it can be said that to inject direct democr acy into the political process, the sparse set of supporters for Prop. 53 (none of them progressive) does not inspire much confidence in this measure. Also, some of the language is vague; written, for example, it’s not clear if the measure applies to educational institutions. Consequently, we urge a “no” vote on Prop. 53.

Proposition 54 - YES, with reservations
Legislature and Legislation, Allows Time to Read Bills

Prop. 54, the Legislature Transparency Amendment, does what it says. It would prohibit the legislature from passing any bill until it has been in print and published on the Internet for 72 hours prior to the vote. It would further require that the legislature make audio recordings of its public proceedings and publish the recordings online within 24 hours, and allow any individual to record any open legislative proceedings either through audio or visual means and these recordings could be transferred to already existing tobacco tax-funded smoking, disease research, physician training, dental disease prevention programs, and law enforcement to prevent interstate smuggling, disease research, physician training, dental disease prevention programs, and law enforcement to prevent interstate smuggling, disease research, physician training, dental disease prevention programs, and law enforcement to prevent interstate smuggling.

It seems on the face of it quite reasonable and innocuous, and “heartening” for democracy. It reduces the “black box” deal ing that never sees public scrutiny; disallows the practice of “cut-and-amend” (as defined by Ballotpedia). “A practice that replaces, at the last minute, every word of a bill with new language written by special interests, thereby making major policy changes with no public input” — and basically would let the public have much more input into bills that come out, because they would have at least a little while to look them over.

It’s also supported by many groups — but that’s where it gets murky, as many of them are GOP-leaning or business-focused, although there are a few others the more progressive side as well, such as Common Cause, the League of Women Voters of California and the California NAACP.

And then when you look at the opposition, it actually comes from the Democratic party, which essentially says that some good legislation can come out of bipartian mea nerization that gets things done quickly (like housing and budget bills). The real reason given is to keep too many days to slow things down, the lobbyists will sweep in and get their members to kill the bills. Further, the bill is backed primarily by a billionaire (Munger) who has opposed progressive issues up and down the line, historically.

We understand and sympathize with the arguments, but are inclined to go with the simpler analysis that says more transparency is better, and then see if it too much time is given to slow things down, the lobbyists will sweep in and get their members to kill the bills. Further, the bill is backed primarily by a billionaire (Munger) who has opposed progressive issues up and down the line, historically.

We give a conditional thumbs up on this one. This bill does seem on the face of it quite reasonable and innocuous, and we of course, generally as always, the rallying cry of “Tax the Rich” is encouraging (in this case millions of dollars liberated from the top two percent of income earners in California). We should vote YES on 55 but be alert as to its longer term political implications.

Proposition 55 - YES
Tax Extension on the Rich, for Education and Healthcare

A position on Prop. 55 seems straightforward: it falls in a category of progressive taxation used for socially valu able services. However, major fiscal measures are rarely free of controversy. In this case, one should not use a label of “with reservation,” but rather “with complicating issues.”

This initiative is largely a renewal of the much higher profile Prop. 50, which passed in 2012. That item was the result of a struggle of contending forces aimed at taxing the upper economic strata. One wing, linked to the CFT (Calif ornia Federation of Teachers), called for a “Millionaire’s tax” to fund a state-wide sales tax extensionaceous that was led by Governor Brown, raising taxes over $250,000, with a small sales tax attached. The final outcome was largely Jerry’s proposal for a temporary tax, with a lessening of the sales tax. It passed with a strong support from the heavy lobbying by the unions and Democratic Party apparatus. The largest beneficiary has been public education.

The real problem, now as then, is that the process by which these measures are developed has undercut much progressive organizing and has assumed a variety of politi cal trade-offs. In the case of Prop. 30, the aforementioned “MT” was much more grass roots; more problematic was the defection to Brown after the elections by public sector unions on a range of issues, such as two-tier pensions, and a backing off of labor’s advising for programs serving the working class, such as the homeless, elderly, and impover ished youth. Regarding Prop. 55, the initial sacrifice was the “Make It Fair” campaign, which aimed at a “split roll” corporate property tax transfer, generating more money and using it to replace the budget for education. But with the re-election of Prop. 13, it would correct one of its most grievous aspects.

What Prop. 55 would do is again greatly aid public education, preventing cuts of up to $4 billion in the first year of implementation. One might argue that public education already has a very privileged status, with Prop. 98 guaranteeing approximately sixty percent of the general funds. Nonetheless, with the continuing issues of California school districts needing more than 20,000 additional teachers along with reduction of class size and more school libraries, the measure would be a huge boon to the CAASB (it is another $6 million for administrative costs). Up to $2 billion would be spent on health care programs for low income children. And based on the pattern of Prop. 30, over ten percent would go to the habitually underfunded colleges. It is hardly surprising that its biggest backer is the 300,000 strong CTA (California Teachers Association).

Proposition 56 - YES
Cigarette Tax to Fund Healthcare, Tobacco Use Prevention, Research

Surprisingly, California now has a rather low tax on cigarettes, only 87 cents per pack. This initiative would in crease the tax to $2.02 per pack, with an equivalent increase on other tobacco products, including electronic cigarettes containing nicotine.

An 80 percent of the tax revenue would increase funding for tobacco-related healthcare through Medi-Cal. Lower-income residents smoke at higher rates and more commonly suffer from tobacco-related diseases, and Medi-Cal often their only choice for affordable healthcare. Cal is often their only choice for affordable healthcare. Commonly suffer from tobacco-related diseases, and Medi-Cal often their only choice for affordable healthcare.

The remaining funds would go to tobacco use pre vention, education and control programs, tobacco-related disease research, tobacco-related health care prevention programs, and law enforcement to prevent cigarette smuggling.

If the higher tax does lead to decreased tobacco con sumption, (which it primarily) the additional tax revenue would be transferred to already existing tobacco tax-funded programs.

The proponents and funders are primarily health care organizations (CFT), which are the usual right-wing anti-tax groups, including ones asso ciated with the infamous ALFC that’s funded by the Koch Brothers. Tobacco companies have already spent $36 million to oppose the measure as of mid-August 2016, and they will likely put in more closer to election day.

Past increases in tobacco taxes have helped to dramati-
cally reduce rates of smoking virtually everywhere in the world. The Federal government tripled its tobacco tax in 2009, resulting in a rapid decrease in smoking rates across the country. 

Vote YES on Prop. 56.

Proposition 57 - YES Sentencing for Non-violent Crimes and Juvenile Criminal Proceedings

Prop. 57 has been major in parts 3 and 4. Section 3 adds Section 32 to Article one of the California Constitution and addresses the length of prison sentences for adults. Section 4 amends the Welfare and Institutions Code provisions for services for juveniles as adults.

Section 3 provides that a state prison inmate convicted of a nonviolent felony offense shall be eligible for parole after completing the term for his or her primary offense, which is the longest term of imprisonment imposed for any offense, excluding any enhancements or consecutive sentences. Of the many sentencing enhancements in California law, some of them are for the defendant’s conduct, such as taking more than $65,000, and others are for a defendant’s status, such as having prior convictions. Section 3 provides that the Department of Corrections can award credits for good behavior, as well as for “approved rehabilitative or educational achievements.”

The California District Attorney’s Association states, in opposition, “California could see inmates serving as little as half as many sentences, maybe less. The pressure on CDCR from the state would be to increase credits significantly in order to relieve prison overcrowding and build new facilities.”

Prop. 57, in part 4, establishes early release for first-time nonviolent offenders. It also establishes time served credits for parole. A “YES” vote on Prop. 57 is warranted because the decision whether to try a minor in adult court will be a judicial decision requiring input from both the prosecution and the defense.

Proposition 58 - YES Allows Bilingual Education

Prop. 58 repeals most of Prop. 227, which passed by 16 percent in November 2000. Prop. 227 mandated that students who had been in California schools for over a year be taught entirely in English in classrooms with other English-speaking students. Students new to English would be taught in English immersion programs. Several studies over the years have shown little difference in test scores between students taught in bilingual classrooms prior to 1998 and in mainstream classrooms subsequently, but test scores do not tell the whole story. One positive result of Prop. 227 was that English learners, through speaking English with friends both in and out of the classroom, developed improved social skills, self-esteem and their social integration in the school setting. Another benefit was that schools could no longer hire “bilingual” teachers from other countries whose English was sometimes poor, and who as a result taught entirely in Spanish, with very limited English Language Development class time daily.

Prop. 227 required that parents who wanted their children to attend bilingual programs had to sign waivers. Any school with more than 20 students whose parents had signed such waivers would be required to provide a bilingual classroom for those students. Due to the requirements of Prop. 227, some students were never offered services for which they qualified, while some schools with large Spanish-speaking populations simply had parents sign waivers at the time of registering their child for school as if they were signing, in order to continue offering bilingual classes, especially in the lower grades. Prop. 58 eliminates the need for waivers.

Proponents of Prop. 58, including the California Teachers Association, make the case that Prop. 58 will expand opportunities for English speaking students to learn a second language in dual immersion programs. Found in school districts, methods teachers can use to teach English, as well as restore local control to schools to provide bilingual classrooms and curricula as they see fit. Prop. 58 also is seen by proponents as restoring the right of families to be able to control their curricular respect of their cultural identities and providing language continuity to their children.

Prop. 58 also reverses the Green Bay Brewery’s control of many serv- ices, to give those most affected by programs most control of the programs that affect them. Prop. 227 took away local control to a degree the Green Party cannot condone. It done well, dual immersion programs, newcomer programs, and graduated bilingual programs have been found to be effective. However, we are concerned that Prop. 58 does not appear to have accountability provisions that would make the programs more accountable to the classroom and poor bilingual programs that existed prior to Prop. 58. Let’s hope the passage of Prop. 58 does not result in throwing out the baby with the bathwater.

Proposition 59 - YES Campaign Finance, Repeal “Citizens United”, Prop. 59 will help big money out of politics and put to rest the fallacy that a corporation is a person entitled to the same rights as a natural person, or “corporate personhood.” Corporate Money has flowed in like a flood and then grown up in love, get pregnant, and give birth to a screaming, squirming, adorable baby. A corporation is no more a person than a louse is a blade of grass. The proposition goes further than asking California’s courts to strike down the corporation’s elected officials to use their authority towards overturning the Supreme Court decision, Citizens United vs. Federal Elec tion Commission.

Companies had already taken over prior to that SCOTUS opinion, so the beauty of Prop. 59 is that, in addition to supporting and limiting campaign contributions, it calls for overturning the “corporate personhood” language… and to make clear that corporations should not have the same constitutional rights as human beings.” Thus, it calls for abolishing “corporate personhood” as well as ending the ridiculous notion that limitless corporate donations to campaigns are legally protected free speech, which draws out most individuals’ voices so our elections are sold to the 1 percent richest.

Democracy is priceless. Most voters will have the good sense to vote for Prop. 59 which costs nothing and is a big step towards government of, by, and for the people. This victory may be the lasting memory of more members of Congress to join Barbara Lee in cosponsoring the We the People Amendment. Of the related constitutional amend- ments that have been introduced in Congress, HJR 48 is the most effective, establishing both that money is not speech and that a corporation is not a person. Most people know that giant corporations wield too much power over our government. This is because in the root of so many others. Depirling corporations like Chevron, Bayer, Walmart, and Monsanto of the legal right to bribe our politicians will barely affect their bottom line. The 2008 and mid-2009 financial meltdown was not affected by this law because they do not abuse their personhood status. Unions and nonprofit advocacy groups will continue doing what they do because this law doesn’t affect them. It was Supreme Court opinions that gave corporations too much power. The Supreme Court can only be overruled via constitutional amendment. We highly recommend vot- ing yes on Prop. 59 which is part of the growing grassroots movement to take the government of, by, and for corporate profit into a democracy.

What you can do to help: http://movetospend.org/, especially the “Get Involved” section.

Proposition 60 - Very Strange, You Decide Adult Films, Condoms

This initiative is the latest round in the battle between Michael Weinstein of the AIDS Healthcare Foundation and the porn industry over mandatory condom use during sex in adult films. Cal/OSHA workplace health and safety standards for the adult film industry already require the use of condoms, but enforcement is complaint driven and non- compliance within the industry is common. This measure would amend the California Labor Code to require produc- ers of adult films to use condoms during sex in film, and to pay for medical exams, vaccines and other health services for the perform- ers. Proponents also establish strict standards for condoms, the cheap, a few dollars and includes requiring producers to get a health license every two years, provide notice of filming, and to keep records that show compliance with health and safety standards. Performers could sue producers and anyone with a financial interest for non-compliance.

The porn industry and many outspoken performers have opposed stiffer standards at every turn. In 2012, Los Angeles County approved Measure B, which is the model for the statewide initiative. (The writer could find no clear evidence of Measure B’s effectiveness or impact on the industry.) The porn industry beat the implementation of stricter standards by filing a 2 vote and in a 2012 Assembly bill with much of the same language as the ini- tiative — in committee. Many performers and the industry contend that condoms do not make for a more reasonable experience between actors, and that a corporation is not a person.

The Green Party supports local control of many ser- vices. And that a corporation is not a person.

The other twist is one that will probably appear in other controversial ballot measures going forward, as a result of the state’s decision on Prop. 8 to not challenge the court’s ruling that the law was unconstitutional. (Prop. 8 banned same-sex marriage.) This initiative has language that could (if legal) allow the prompt to have standing to defend the law of the state does not.

The main proponents are the AIDS Healthcare Founda- tion, the largest nonprofit organization serving HIV/AIDS patients worldwide; Beyond AIDS; the American Sexual Health Association; and a host of other healthcare organiza- tions. They have millions to spend (http://FAIRCA.org/). The opposition appears to be led by San Francisco State Senator Mark Leno (gay, bw) and includes the performer- oriented, non-profit, the Center for Sexual Expression, a project of Los Angeles, Los Angeles Gay Lesbian Center, the SF AIDS Foundation, and the porn industry Free Speech Coalition. http://donoraddresses.com/. The International En- tertainment Adult Union has taken no position.

You decide.

Proposition 61 - YES State Prescription Drug Purchases, Pricing Standards

This small “good idea, why didn’t anyone think of this sooner?” (for the 17 percent of the American population which is currently bad for patients (almost everyone) and bad for the state government.

The California Prescription Relief Act supports regu- lating drug prices by requiring state agencies to pay the same prices that the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (USDVA) pays for prescription drugs. Prop. 61 is supported by Zenei Cortez, the Co-President of the California Nurses Association (CNA)/National Nurses Organizing Commit- tee; Nancy McPherson, State Director of AARP California; and others. It is opposed by the California Taxpayers As- sociation, the California Medical Association (CMA), and others.

When the major nurses’ association and the major California doctors’ association opposed Prop. 61, a lack of action as an issue, we take a step back and ask whether the CMA is generally more conservative than the CNA. CNA is part on next page
Proposition 61

Appeals. According to the Death Penalty Information Center, the criminal investigation through the lengthy trials, and changes in either crime or murder rates. That have abolished the death penalty show no significant rates than states without such laws. They don’t! States that have it would have lower crime rates or murder rates with whether the state has a right or reason to kill them. There are currently 743 people awaiting execution in California. Five of the problems with the death penalty:

1. Almost all death row inmates could not afford their legal defense attorneys with little experience in trying capital cases, the risk of executing the innocent can never be eliminated.
2. The death penalty is discriminatory and is used disproportionately against the poor, minorities and members of racial, ethnic and religious communities. Prosecutors seek the death penalty far more frequently when the victim of a homicide is white than when the victim is of African descent or of another ethnic/racial origin.
3. Humans are fallible. Even without police and prosecutorial misconduct and without serious errors by court-appointed defense attorneys with little experience in trying capital cases, the risk of executing the innocent can never be eliminated.
4. The death penalty has no deterrent effect. If it did, states that have it would have lower crime rates or murder rates than states without such laws. They don’t! States that have abolished the death penalty show no significant changes in either crime or murder rates.
5. The cost of the death penalty is astronomical, from the criminal investigation through the lengthy trials, and appeals. According to the Death Penalty Information Center, if the governor commuted the sentences of all death row inmates to life without parole, it would save $170 million a year, with a saving of $5 billion over the next 20 years. (+http://www.amnestyusa.org/our-work/issues/death-penalty/us-death-penalty-facts)

Passage of Prop. 62 would end the death penalty in California, replacing it with life imprisonment without possibility of parole. Regardless of your position on life without parole, it is preferable to the death penalty.

Yes, Yes, Yes on 62!

Proposition 63 - NO, because retired cops are exempt

Firearms, Ammunition Sales

The “Safety for All” Initiative would prohibit the possession of large-capacity ammunition magazines (holding over 10 bullets), a prohibition we support. However, that was already signed into law via SB 1446 in July; and, like all recent gun-control measures, Prop. 63 EXEMPTS active and retired law enforcement officers from their restrictions.

Prop. 63 would require all other purchasers of any ammunition, even just for duck hunting, to pass a background check and obtain CA Department of Justice authorization (which involves being entered into a DOJ database). It also restricts non-exempt people from giving ammunition to anyone they know (or can reasonably guess) should not have access to the ammunition.

If passed, Prop. 63 would become the eighth firearm restriction law adopted in California in 2016, with twelve more in the pipeline. Note that ballot initiatives are far more difficult to change than laws created by the Legislature, so we would be stuck with problematic details, such as these exemptions. New York recently found a similar law to be unenforceable.

Prop. 63 explicitly exempts both current and retired law enforcement officers (which includes IRS officers, park rangers, etc.), some of whom were forced to “honorably retire” by Obama’s新的excessive violence against police officers. Thus, this measure fails to hold accountable some of the most out-of-control abusers of firearms. Why would an off-duty or retired law enforcement officer (who is considered an ordinary citizen) ever need a large-capacity magazine to rapid fire more than 10 bullets, or need more untracked ammunition than everyone else? Only in a dystopian police-state scenario.

When Black Lives Matter and allied groups are striving for police accountability, we cannot endorse a law that exempts cops and retired cops. A Federal Civil Rights lawsuit has been filed to strike down this violation of Equal Protection standards in existing firearm-related laws.

This fatal flaw has been recognized by the San Francisco Greens and some civil rights groups. Prop. 63 is opposed by responsible gun-owners’ groups and even many law-enforcement groups. NO ONE here needs semiautomatic weapons of war.

REGISTER GREEN
for the first time

If you have been registered GREEN and you changed your registration to vote for Bernie Sanders in the June primary

COME BACK: RE-REGISTER GREEN
http://registervote.ca.gov/
**GO PAPERLESS**

The PDF version of this Voter Guide is available on our website at http://acgreens.wordpress.com/voter-guides. Would you like to save some trees and printing/postage costs? PLEASE LET US KNOW at acgreenparty@aol.com 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!

Read the CANDIDATES’ QUESTIONNAIRES Online

Most of the candidates returned our questionnaires, for most of the local races. 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: http://acgreens.org, and then click on the “Candidate Questionnaires” tab near the top of the page.

---

**Federal Offices**

President and Vice-President - Jill Stein and Ajamu Baraka

U.S. Senate – No endorsement, please see write-up

U.S. House of Representatives, District 13 – No endorsement, please see write-up

**State Offices**

State Senate, District 9 - No endorsement, please see write-up

State Assembly, District 15 - No endorsement, please see write-up

State Assembly, District 18 - No endorsement, please see write-up

**Superior Court Judge**

Office #1 - Scott Jackson

**Special School Districts**

Peralta Community College, Area 6 - Karen Weinstein, with reservations

**City Offices**

**Alameda**

City Council – Jennifer Roloff. Don’t vote for Anderlof or Wella.

City Auditor – Kevin Kearney

City Treasurer – Kevin Kennedy

School Board – Unfortunately, we were not able to cover this race.

Please see the candidates’ completed questionnaires at:
https://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires/.

Alamedans, please help us!

**Albany**

Recommendations provided by the Albany Greens:

- City Council – Nick Pilch, Peter Mass; Erik Giesen-Fields, with reservations.
- Do not vote for Michael Barnes.
- Treasurer – No endorsement, please see write-up.
- School Board – Clementina Duron and Jon Raj Destin

**Berkeley**

Mayor – #1 and #2: Jesse Arreguin and Kris Worthington; #3: Guy “Mike” Lee

Don’t vote for Capitelli

State Council, District 2 – #1: Nanci Armstrong-Temple; #2: Cheryl Davila, NO Moore!

- City Council, District 3 – #1: Ben Bartlett, #2: Mark Coplan, #3: Al Murray

Don’t vote for Matthews.

- City Council, District 5 – Sophie Hahn

City Council, District 6 – Defeat Wengraf #1: Fred Dodsworth, #2: Isabelle Gaston

School Board – No Endorsement, please see write-up.

Rent Board – Christina Murphy, Alejandro Soto-Vigil, Leah Simon-Weiberg and Igor Tregub. Vote for all 4!

* These candidates have been ranked, but not endorsed

**Emeryville**


School Board – Barbara Inch, Ken Bukowski, with reservations

**Fremont**

City Council – Cullen Tiernan, Vinnie Bacon

**Oakland**

City Council, At-Large – #1: Matt Hummel, #2: Rebecca Kaplan

Don’t vote for Moore.

- City Council, District 1 – Dan Kalb, with reservations
- City Council, District 3 – Nomi Session
- City Council, District 5 – Noel Gallo, with reservations
- City Council, District 7 – Neihaya Isaura, Don’t vote for Reid.
- City Attorney – No Endorsement, please see write-up.
- School Board, District 1 – Don MacKay
- School Board District 3 – #1: Khairul Wigenston, #2: Ben Lang, with reservations.
- Don’t vote for Hodges.
- School Board, District 5 – #1: Mike Hutchinson, #2: Roseann Torres
- Don’t vote for Trenado.
- School Board, District 7 – Chris Jackson

* These candidates have been ranked, but not endorsed

**Special Districts**

- A.C. Transit, At-Large - Dorel Jones, with reservations
- BART, District 3 - Rebecca Saltman, with reservations

(Encouragement for Varun Paul)

BART, District 5 – John McPartland

BART, District 7 – Lateshah Simon

EBRPD, Ward 2 – Des Rosario

EBRPD, Ward 4 – Daniel Chesmore

**Local Measures**

A1 – Alameda County Housing Bond – No Endorsement, please see write-up

B1 – Alameda City Continuation of School Parcel Tax – Yes

C1 – A.C. Transit Parcel Tax Extension – Yes

- Berkeley Public Schools Educational Excellence Act of 2016 – Yes
- Hayward Area Recreation and Park District Bond – Yes, with reservations

G1 – Oakland School Parcel Tax – Yes, with reservations

RR – BART Infrastructure Bond – Yes, with standard bond reservations

B1 – Alameda City Continuation of School Parcel Tax – Yes

K1 – Alameda Transfer of $3.7 Million Annually from Alameda Municipal Power to the City – No

L1 – Alameda City Council’s Rent Control Measure – No

M1 – Oakland Just Cause Eviction and Rent Control Measure – Yes

N1 – Albany Residential Parking Requirements – Yes

O1 – Albany Soda Tax – Yes

P1 – Albany Sidewalk Repairs - Yes

Q1 – Albany Vacancy Procedures, Pension Board, Copies, Etc. - Yes

R1 – Albany Civil Service Board – Yes

S1 – Albany School Board Removal of Term Limits – Yes

E1 – Berkeley Public Schools Educational Excellence Act of 2016 – Yes

T1 – Berkeley Infrastructure and Facilities Bond – Yes, with reservations

U1 – Berkeley Rental Unit Business License Tax, City Sponsored - Yes, Yes, Yes

DD – Berkeley Rental Unit Business License Tax, Big Landlord Initiative – No, No, No

Vi – Berkeley GANN Appropriation Limit Override – Yes

W1 – Berkeley Citizens Redistricting Commission – Yes

X1 – Berkeley Public Campaign Financing – Yes

Y1 – Berkeley Youth Voting – Yes

Z1 – Berkeley Low Income Housing Authorization – Yes

AA – Oakland Rent Board Ordinance – Yes

BB – Berkeley Minimum Wage – City Sponsored - No

CC – Berkeley Minimum Wage – Labor-backed Citizens’ Initiative – Yes, please see write-up.

DD – Berkeley Rental Unit Business License Tax, Big Landlord Initiative – No, No, No

EE – Hayward Cannabis Tax Authorization – Yes

G1 – Oakland School Parcel Tax – Yes, with reservations

HH – Oakland Soda Tax – Yes, with concerns, please see write-up.

II – Oakland Increase of Maximum Lease Term – Neutral, please see write-up.

JJ – Oakland Just Cause Eviction and Rent Control Measure – Yes

KK – Oakland Street Repair and Infrastructure Bond – No

LL – Oakland Police Commission and Review Agency – No Endorsement, please see write-up.

C1 – A.C. Transit Parcel Tax Extension – Yes

RR – BART Infrastructure Bond – Yes, with standard bond reservations

F1 – Hayward Area Recreation and Park District Bond – Yes, with reservations

**State Propositions**

- School Bonds, K-12 and Community College; Limits Developer Fees - No
- State Fees on Hospitals, Federal Medi-Cal Matching Funds - Yes, with reservations
- Revenue Bonds Requiring Statewide Voter Approval - No
- Legislation and Legislation, Allows Time to Read Bills - Yes, with reservations
- Tax Extension on the Rich, for Education and Healthcare - Yes
- Tax on Cigarette Use Prevention, Research - Yes
- Sentencing for Non-violent Crimes and Juvenile Criminal Proceedings - Yes
- Allows Bilingual Education - Yes
- Campaign Finance, Repeal Citizens United - Yes
- Adult Films, Condoms - Very Strange, You Decide, please see write-up.
- State Prescription Drug Purchases, Pricing Standards - Yes
- End the Death Penalty – Yes, Yes, Yes!
- Firearms, Ammunition Sales – No, because retired cops are exempt
- Marijuana Legalization - Yes
- Carry-Out Bags Measure from the Plastics Industry - No
- Speed Up the Death Penalty – No, No, No!
- The “Candidate Questionnaires” tab near the top of the page.

Although some of these recommendations may not be what you would have chosen, please consider the source. The Albany Greens have thoroughly researched each candidate and each measure. They have considered the candidates’ records, their financial charter, and their position on the issues. They have examined the measure wording and the details of the programs. When a candidate or measure does not meet their standards, it is not listed in their recommendations. However, they are willing to add additional candidates or measures if you write to them.

We cannot endorse every candidate and every measure. They simply cannot be covered in the limited space available.

Please use the “Candidate Questionnaires” tab near the top of the page.

The Green Voter Card is your guide to the candidates. Print it out and clip it and bring with you to the polls (and photocopy for your friends!)

Election Day: November 8, 2016

Green Voter Card

Clip and bring with you to the polls (and photocopy for your friends!)
Green Voter Card

Federal Offices

President and Vice-President
Jill Stein and Ajamu Baraka

City Offices

Berkeley
Mayor – #1 and #2: Jesse Arreguin and Kriss Worthington, #3: Guy "Mike" Lee*. Don't vote for Capitelli
City Council, District 2 – #1: Nanci Armstrong-Temple, #2: Cheryl Davila, NO Moore!
City Council, District 5 – Sophie Hahn

Emeryville
City Council – Christian Patz, John Bauters, and Ally Medina. Don't vote for Engel.
School Board – Barbara Inch; Ken Bukowski, with reservations

Oakland
City Council, At-Large – #1: Matt Hummel, #2: Rebecca Kaplan*
Don't vote for Moore.

School Board – Don Macleay
* = These candidates have been ranked, but not endorsed

Local Measures

L1 - Alameda City Council's Rent Control Measure – No
M1 - Alameda Renters Coalition's Rent Control Measure – Yes
U1 - Berkeley Rental Unit Business License Tax, City Sponsored – Yes, Yes, Yes!
DD - Berkeley Rental Unit Business License Tax, Big Landlord Initiative – No, No, No!

State Propositions

59 - Campaign Finance, Repeal – Citizens United -- Yes
62 - End the Death Penalty – Yes, Yes, Yes!
64 - Marijuana Legalization – Yes
67 - Uphold the Ban on Single-Use Plastic Bags – Yes

Please see page 19 for the Full Voter Card!

Read the CANDIDATES’ QUESTIONNAIRES!: See the Box on Page 4
Go PAPERLESS!: See the Front Page Box

November 8, 2016

Online version at: http://acgreens.org