“Stein is not just up against the Democratic and Repub¬lican nominees. She is up against a rigid two-party system that erects high barriers to those who seek to open up the process. It is uncommon for independent and third-party candidates to get over and around those barriers. But this is an uncommon year in American politics.” — John Nichols, August 19, 2016, The Nation, “Jill Stein Should Be Part of A 4-Way Presidential Debate”

In the 2016 presidential election, the growing corruption of U.S. electoral politics and the disfranchise¬ment of what’s left of our democracy is on display: the resignations of numerous campaign and party officials from scandalous ethical violations exposed in leaked emails; the swirling controversy surrounding the foundations of the Bernie Sanders’ campaign; allegations of pay-to-play favoritism, and on the other, outright illegal activity; a meeting between a former president and the Attorney General on an airport tarmac, followed by a non¬indictment recommendation from the FBI chief; a corporate media telling us that our only choices are a loud-mouthed carnival barker whose racism, misogyny and bigotry have made white supremacy mainstream, or a deeply flawed, entrenched politician whose record offers us more war and more Wall Street.

Emeryville City Council
Christian Patz, John Bauters, and Ally Medina
Don’t vote for Engel

This year there is an unprecedented open election for the Emeryville City Council with none of the incumbents seeking re-election. We have the opportunity to build upon the Progressive council majority chosen by voters in the last two elections. Progressive candidates need to take two of the three seats, since Green-endorsed Councilwoman Jac Asher is not seeking re-election.

To expand on what progressives have built in Emeryville, we endorse Christian Patz, John Bauters and Ally Medina. All three are Democrats but have real progressive bona fides. Christian Patz has served on the Emery School Board, has experience in making policy, and has been willing to be a lone dissenter on the School Board in order to do what’s right.

Against this backdrop, when Jill Stein appears on the news in her lavender blazer, energetic and 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. But 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 longtime teacher of internal medicine, Stein has led initiatives promoting healthy communities, local green economies, and the revitalization of democracy – championing issues such as campaign finance reform, green jobs, racially just redistricting, and the cleanup of incinerators, coal plants, and toxics.

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 Constitu¬tional Rights, 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 debate.
The "GPAC" is one of the few County Councils that produce a Voter Guide for each election. We meet about 7 times a year to talk about the election season and beyond. Clip out the enclosed coupon to send in your donation today.

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

The Green Party of Alameda County is coordinating tabling, precinct walking, phone banking, and other volunteer activities. The Green Party County Council meets in the evening on the 2nd Sunday each month at 6:45pm. This is the regular "business" meeting of the Alameda 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
2022 Blake Street, Suite A, Berkeley, CA 94704-2604
(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-
topic). To get occasional announcements about current
Green Party of Alameda County activities send an email to:
announcementsGPAC-subscribe@yahoogroups.com.

The Green Party of Alameda County Activities:

- 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.riseup.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, Yahoo Group, 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 re-activate 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 Arkiv, Jan Arnold, Victoria Ashley, Bill Baldaster, Paul Burton (page layout), Harry Chomsky/Vicente Cruz, Mica Daniel, Brian Donahue, Chris Finn, Brian Geiser, Mandeppe Gill, Brian Good, Dave Heller, Greg Jan, Saeid Karamooh, Michael Kaufman, Tina Kimmel, Bob Marsh, Pani Marsh, Hugh Moore, Samarah Morgan, David Morrison, Michael Rubin, Susan Schachler, Bob Scofield, John Selawsky, Larry Shoup, Phoebe Sorgen, Kent Sparling, Pam Spevack, Lisa Stephens, Joan Strasser, Laura Wells, and Nani Wishner.

You can also read our Voter Guide online at www.acgreens.wordpress.com. Please check it out.

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 un-
resolved differences that prevented us from agreeing on a position, or no position was warranted.

We only endorse bond measures for essential public projects. Some are unlikely to be funded otherwise. Our en-
forcement “Yes, with standard bond reservations” reflects our position that funding through bonds is more costly and therefore less fiscally responsible than other ways.

Where no recommendation appears, we did not evaluate our position that funding through taxes is more costly and therefore less fiscally responsible than other ways.

We only endorse bond measures for essential public services, and at the same time we educate and organize for better ways of raising revenue in the future.

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, high-
ways, health care and other vital services.

Proposition 13 lowered property taxes and prohibited im-
pulsion of any new "ad valorem" (according to value) taxes on real property. Prop 13 also requires a 2/3 vote of the legislature to increase state taxes. This super-majority is a steep hurdle to jump, especially when slightly more than 1/3 of our legislators have pledged to vote against any and all taxes.

Taxes are now 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.

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

Bonds meanwhile enrich and give tax breaks to wealthy investors, and encourage scams by casino capitalists on Wall Street. Super-rich individuals and corporations avoid paying taxes by having money transferred to them in the form of bonds, and get even richer from the interest. Implementing a publicly-owned State Bank is one way California could use its own capital to fund public projects, and invest the interest.

Property taxes before Prop 13 came primarily from commercial properties, and now primarily from homes. Homeowners areconomics and the tax loopholes allow corporate properties to escape reassessment. Parcel taxes are often the same for large properties and small condos. For some voters parcel taxes are outstripping their basic property taxes.

Sales taxes have been relied upon for balancing bud-
gets, 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 average $1.6 million pay 8.8 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.

Support Your Green Party! During the election season, the Green Party cannot exist without your help. Unlike some political parties, we do not receive funding from government, nor do we rely on donations from generous people just like you.

In addition, our mailing and printing costs have signifi-
cantly 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.
In an op-ed for The Hill, Stein made her key point, “The street demonstrations outside the DNC in Philadelphia. Stein helped the transition by compassionately vocalizing de-registering Democrat en masse to join the Green Party. rightwing politics of Clinton, proceeded to “DemExit”— streets which ultimately decimated Occupy in the U.S., contested convention—avoided the police violence in the endorsement of Clinton—despite months of promising a the 99 percent”) in 2011. While Bernie’s pre-convention vote 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, ten million, she gets every Electoral College vote.

you may ask, “In this close election, what if Drumpf von Clownface wins the state?” Remember that California won’t be voting in a vacuum: if he can even get close to winning California, Trump will overwhelmingly carry the major “battleground,” or “swing” states in the East.

But, you may ask: “Don’t we have to vote for The Hillary to stop The Donkey of the Decade?” No! If not you just vote for the lesser of two evils.

Interview with Dr. Jill Stein. Thinking and voting outside the two-party box. Socialist Worker, May 9, 2016 https://socialistworker.org/2016/05/09/thinking-outside-the-two-party-box.

Despite the consequences of lesser-of-two-evils voting, many are persuaded by the admonition to not “waste their vote” on a Third Party — this time, the “practical” urgency of defecting against Donald Trump must override the principle of voting one’s conscience. But whatever its merits, the logic of the “spoiler 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, ten million, she gets every Electoral College vote.

you may ask, “In this close election, what if Drumpf von Clownface 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. This system destroys 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 far-sighted 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 Democrats. California’s “progressive” wing of the dominant Democratic Party favors fairer voting system like Ranked Choice Voting and Proportional Representation, both used in many nations to better represent the people’s wishes. PR is used in over 90 nations worldwide.

California Attorney General Kamala Harris is the favored candidate of the plutocracy in this race and is very likely to win. She has raised by far the most money, and received the most attention (mainly favorable) from the establishment media. Harris’s career in politics began when she became a protégé of state kingpin Willie Brown in the early 1990s. Brown and other members of the plutocratic wing of the California Democratic Party (such as the billionnaire Feinstein and the multimillionaire Pelosi) helped Harris with jobs, endorsements and election fundraising. She then elected to the California Senate. Despite the culture of fragility stressed by Governor Jerry Brown, Harris’s rapid and easy rise to prominence and clear, successful record has earned her the nickname “the Dog.” Democrat She makes the typical argument that since her parents were immigrants, she will be on the side of the excluded and oppressed. Her entire political and ideological orientation and concrete votes while in office completely refute this claim to ensure the unwary voter.

California Attorney General Kamala Harris is the favored candidate of the plutocracy in this race and is very likely to win. She has raised by far the most money, and received the most attention (mainly favorable) from the establishment media. Harris’s career in politics began when she became a protégé of state kingpin Willie Brown in the early 1990s. Brown and other members of the plutocratic wing of the California Democratic Party (such as the billionnaire Feinstein and the multimillionaire Pelosi) helped Harris with jobs, endorsements and election fundraising. She then elected to the California Senate. Despite the culture of fragility stressed by Governor Jerry Brown, Harris’s rapid and easy rise to prominence and clear, successful record has earned her the nickname “the Dog.” Democrat She makes the typical argument that since her parents were immigrants, she will be on the side of the excluded and oppressed. Her entire political and ideological orientation and concrete votes while in office completely refute this claim to ensure the unwary voter.

California Attorney General Kamala Harris is the favored candidate of the plutocracy in this race and is very likely to win. She has raised by far the most money, and received the most attention (mainly favorable) from the establishment media. Harris’s career in politics began when she became a protégé of state kingpin Willie Brown in the early 1990s. Brown and other members of the plutocratic wing of the California Democratic Party (such as the billionnaire Feinstein and the multimillionaire Pelosi) helped Harris with jobs, endorsements and election fundraising. She then elected to the California Senate. Despite the culture of fragility stressed by Governor Jerry Brown, Harris’s rapid and easy rise to prominence and clear, successful record has earned her the nickname “the Dog.” Democrat She makes the typical argument that since her parents were immigrants, she will be on the side of the excluded and oppressed. Her entire political and ideological orientation and concrete votes while in office completely refute this claim to ensure the unwary voter.

As the Jill Stein and Ajamu Baraka campaign gains access in more states and their poll numbers rise, we can continue give a voice to the public outcry against corrup-
The most detailed answer Thurmord 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 the idea of reformation of Prop. 13.”

In some cases, Thurmord’s questionnaire answer was deliberately misleading. For example, when asked “What must a constituent do in order to meet with you?”, he answered: “All a constituent needs to do is contact my office and set up an appointment.” In fact, that appointment will be with one of Thurmord’s staffers. Thurmord himself does not meet with constituents. He rarely holds town hall meetings. He does make campaign appearances, but he appears slick and sincere. His behavior as a new member of the Assembly has occasionally been an embarrassment (see https://www.verybably.com/newsitem/2015.06/17/18773615.php).

Thurmord’s first term was a disappointment, since he was put into office in 2014 in a progressive wave, supported by the Greens. It seems possible, but unlikely, that he’ll improve as he gains more experience.

His only challenger is UC Berkeley College Republican Loni Hancock, who was politic but declined to answer our questionnaire.

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

State Assembly District 18

No Endorsement

The Democratic incumbent, Rob Bonta, represents all of Oakland except for the northern portion, plus Alameda and most of San Leandno.

Bonta is becoming more progressive with time. We approve of him after he returned the Greens questionnaire. He did not do much after the last election. It’s true that he described concrete, answers to us about specifically. We appreciate him returning the questionnaire. He has substantially more progressive than he actually is. But he had lots of good things to say this time, in essentially every category. In person, he appears to be genuinely engaged and concerned.

Bonta claims that he has not taken any donations from Big Oil, Big Tobacco, or WalMart,” which is great. Of course, by the Greens. It seems possible, but unlikely, that he’ll improve as he gains more experience.

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.

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 incumbent Tony Thurmond’s answers to our detailed and concrete questionnaire were mostly vague generalities. He deferred several times to his website, but the 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 PDF version of this Voter Guide is available at http://agreens.wordpress.com/voter-guides. Would you like to see some trees and printing/postage costs? PLEASE LET US KNOW at aagreensparty@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 215 W. College Ave., 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 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. He clerked in the civil law in a 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 a free legal aid to poor people. He is still on the Board of Elizabeth House, a transition program for formerly incarcerated women. After earning a J.D. at George Washington 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 Victory 2012, Black Women’s Political Power Org., and organized for Political Action, and over three dozen Alameda County Superintendents Court Judges.

Barbara Thomas also has experience in both civil and criminal litigation. She volunteers for prisoners, veterans, and the homeless, and formerly served as an Alameda City Council Member. Although she advised and represented landlords in disputes including criminal, family, tenants, and products liability, we are not endorsing her because we learned since the June primary that she has opposed rent control ordinances and restrictions on no-cause evictions. We urge Green Voter Guide readers to research her history more thoroughly.

Alameda Community Colleges

Alameda Community Colleges — Laney, Merritt, College of Alameda, and Berkeley City College — play a critical role in educating local students, most of whom are working people, children of working people, and people of color. The Peralta Board of Trustees has ultimate responsibility for governing the Peralta District Office and its four colleges.

Four seats on the Peralta Board of Trustees are up for election, but only one seat can actually be filled by the November ballot. This is because three incumbents are running unopposed, and the Peralta Board has opted not to pay the Alameda County Voter Registration office election expenses in the amount of thousands of dollars for single-candidate races. Two long-time incumbents, elected in 2004, are Trustee Bill Withrow (Area 1, Alameda, part of Oakland) and Nicky Gonzalez Yuen (Area 4, Berkeley flatsland, Emeryville, Albany). By merit, these two are endorsers for re-election.

In 2012, the Peralta Board of Trustees adopted sweeping changes to the rules of the Alameda City College and Berkeley City College districts. The City of Alameda Ballot Measures and Offices

City of Alameda Ballot Measures and Offices

Measure B1 - YES Continuation of School Parcel Tax

We support adequately funding our schools and recommend voting YES to continue the parcel tax for another seven years. However, we urge voters to contact state representatives to change provisions in Proposition 13 dealing with corporations so that residents are not asked to bear the burden of an unfair tax assessment formula.

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

The 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 repaired 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 exemption from 62 to 65. Many of the seniors currently on social security will find their taxes increasing.

While we don’t mind the city collecting equal taxes from all residents, Alameda voters ought not to 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.

Measure L1 - NO City Council’s Rent Control Measure

Measure M1 - YES Alameda Renters Coalition’s Rent Control Measure

Two rent measures are on the ballot. Measure L1 comes from the city council, Measure M1 from a coalition of renters. Both seek to stabilize rising rents and affect only certain rental units. The city council ordinance can be rescinded or changed at any time by a majority of the city council. M1 is a charter amendment supported by a local tenants’ organization, the Alameda Renters Coalition (ARC), and can only be changed by a vote of the people.

The city council attempted to address escalating rents by passing an ordinance in 2012 that would cap rent increases at no more than 5 percent annually, unless the landlord and tenant agreed otherwise. It would allow “no cause” evictions and require landlords to cover moving expenses in some cases.

Renters who did not believe that the protections in the city ordinance went far enough placed a measure on the ballot that would allow the city charter to cap rent increases according to a cost-of-living metric (Consumer Price Index) and forbid “no cause” evictions. The renters’ charter amendment also calls for an elected rent board rather than one appointed by the city council.

The city council placed its own ordinance on the ballot in an attempt to defeat the renters’ measure. We urge a Yes vote on the renters’ measure M1 and a NO vote on the council measure L1.

Alameda City Council

Jennifer Roloff

Don’t vote for Ashcraft or Vella

Jennifer Roloff represents the young families that have moved into Alameda. She is critical of the Council’s present course of development. They have approved the construction of 1,845 new housing units, 1,473 of which are market rate, more than twice Alameda’s state law goal of 743. Only 370 are affordable units. She has emphasized that Alameda has 1,871 units below the state goal of 970. She proposes that further market rate homes be approved until we experience the impact of those already approved, and concentrate on meeting our housing stock goals for those who have built or purchased their hous- ing for teachers and other city workers who do not qualify for affordable housing. She also supports devoting more of our available land for commercial development so that more of our citizens can work and live here on the island.

Weinstein is endorsed by the Peralta Federation of Teachers; Alameda Labor Council; Alameda Building and Trades Council; National Union of Healthcare Workers; and many local and state elected officials and community leaders. Our reservations are that Weinstein is the Vice President of the Berkeley Democratic Club, who has endorsed Berkeley candidates more conservative than the candidates supported by Greens.

Her opponent Nick Rossnick did not return a questionnaire. His candidate Facebook page suggests that he has connections to charter school advocacy organizations.

In her professional life, Weinstein was a mental health counselor at Kaiser. She expresses her commitment to students, especially young people. She has previously incarcerated, and undocumented students.

On her questionnaire, she described accomplishments she had achieved for the last four years including working with underrepresented community college students and Dreamers to raise funds for a center; serving on the Berkeley Commission on the Status of Women to tackle the issue of sexual assault on college campuses; and serving as a Board Member of the Berkeley Public Schools Foundation to establish music scholarships for low income students.

Weinstein is endorsed by the Peralta Federation of Teachers; Alameda Labor Council; Alameda Building and Trades Council; National Union of Healthcare Workers; and many local and state elected officials and community leaders. Our reservations are that Weinstein is the Vice President of the Berkeley Democratic Club, who has endorsed Berkeley candidates more conservative than the candidates supported by Greens.

Her opponent Nick Rossnick did not return a questionnaire. His candidate Facebook page suggests that he has connections to charter school advocacy organizations.

In her professional life, Weinstein was a mental health counselor at Kaiser. She expresses her commitment to students, especially young people. She has previously incarcerated, and undocumented students.

On her questionnaire, she described accomplishments she had achieved for the last four years including working with underrepresented community college students and Dreamers to raise funds for a center; serving on the Berkeley Commission on the Status of Women to tackle the issue of sexual assault on college campuses; and serving as a Board Member of the Berkeley Public Schools Foundation to establish music scholarships for low income students.

Weinstein is endorsed by the Peralta Federation of Teachers; Alameda Labor Council; Alameda Building and Trades Council; National Union of Healthcare Workers; and many local and state elected officials and community leaders. Our reservations are that Weinstein is the Vice President of the Berkeley Democratic Club, who has endorsed Berkeley candidates more conservative than the candidates supported by Greens.

Her opponent Nick Rossnick did not return a questionnaire. His candidate Facebook page suggests that he has connections to charter school advocacy organizations.
and currently owns a home near Webster Street. Tony is very accessible and easy to talk to, holding coffee hours twice a week. His votes reflect an independent, critical position on development and development. He proposed the currently underway $400,000 citywide transportation and transit planning study, although some would have rather seen those resources spent directly on implementation. His answers to our 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 runs a neighborhood association. So we wonder whether he is just getting better at spanning 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 measures, discussed below, align with Green Party values.

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. Recommendations provided by the Albany Greens:

City Auditor
Kevin Kearney

The other measures, discussed below, align with Green Party priorities on rent control and the Green Party supports them all. Measure Q1 and Measure R1 are housekeeping improvements that require voter approval to amend the City Charter, and have no organized opposition. The latter measures, discussed below, align with Green Party values.

City Treasurer
Kevin Kennedy

Both of these elected officials have been very accessible to citizens and citizen groups for candid explanations of city finances. The City Council’s stakeholders have some concerns 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 informative 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 Auditor’s position 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 in City Hall is aware of the Auditor’s position.” Jeff Bratzer, Jeff Bratzer, did not return our questionnaire even though we made several e-mail and phone requests asking him to do so. Both Bratzer and McMahon are supported by the conservative Alamedans United PAC. The compensation for both the Auditor and the Treasurer positions is very minimal, less than $50K a year, if that much. Incumbents Kearney and Kennedy are doing a fine job and both deserve to be re-elected.

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 City Offices and Measures

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 a parking lot on every corner and they trusted the process of representative democracy to respect their wishes. They anticipated the excess of street parking that made it easy to own a car 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, more inconvenient, and reduces our per-capita carbon footprint.

The even 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 modernizing parking requirements just in that zone or just for certain qualifying projects.

By passing Measure N1, Albany residents can put ineffective “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?

It may be too early to know for sure. Berkeley is the only place in the U.S. with a soda tax today. A pre-election study suggests it is working to reduce soda consumption, but the study has been criticized as relying on self-reporting rather than hard data. Meanwhile, opponents criticize the implementation of the tax, which is subject to unfortunate infrastructure. The tax doesn’t quite raise the prices of sodas, but may instead raise the prices of groceries generally. Even when it works as hoped, the tax disproportionately hits the poor and people of color, due to their higher average soda consumption relative to income. These critiques are expressed most loudly by the beer industry, of course, but also by some progressives, including Bernie Sanders. [{Please also see the concerns discussed in the Oakland Soda Tax article, Measure HH}]

The Green Party platform endorses soda taxes in general, and Berkeley’s tax in particular, because if it successfully convinces communities join together to create a regional tax that won’t just push people to shop elsewhere. Albany should contribute to the effort by passing its soda tax. Future studies may help determine whether the positive outcomes indeed outweigh the negative.

Measure P1 - YES Sidewalk Repairs

Sidewalks and sidewalks together make up a network that allows people to get around. Whether we are walking, biking, driving, or riding transit, we use both streets and sidewalks for nearly all of our travel. Yet streets are traditionally maintained using public funds, while sidewalks have been the responsibility of adjacent homeowners. It is both unfair and impractical to expect homeowners individually to maintain a high-quality sidewalk network. Unfair, because damage is typically caused by street trees that belong to the city. Impractical, because the city has very little leverage to force homeowners to make prompt repairs. Anybody who walks in Albany can see the consequences: the sidewalks are laced with extreme tripping hazards, causing difficulty and danger for people pushing strollers, children biking, people walking at night, and anybody with mobility challenges.

The fairest solution would be to maintain the sidewalk network using public funds, just like the street network. Measure P1 moves in the direction by imposing a small property tax to raise revenue for sidewalk repair. Unfortunately homeowners will still bear some responsibility, due to tradition and state law, but the city will try to discover and fix the worst problems each year.

The tax is calibrated by lot size. People who live more densely, apartment dwellers in particular, pay the least because they are least responsible for the kind of sprawl that requires lengthy sidewalks. The measure also provides relief for some low-income owners and tenants. It’s always painful to raise the cost of living in a place like Albany, but in this case the additional cost is low and the benefit in walkability should be very worthwhile.

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

Measure R1 - YES Civil Service Board

Measure S1 - YES School Board Removal of Term Limits

We recommend you do not vote for Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft or Malia Vella, who are funded by the conservative Alamedans United PAC. The compensation for both the Auditor and the Treasurer positions is very minimal, less than $50K a year, if that much. Incumbents Kearney and Kennedy are doing a fine job and both deserve to be re-elected.

City Council

Nick Pilch and Peter Maas
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 questionnaire; 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.

All candidates favor passage of Albany ballot measures N1 (parking requirements) and P1 (sidewalk parcel tax). Our 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 commitment to fair and sensitive treatment of the homeless and those in need of social services. He applauded her advocacy for realizing the vision of a Paul O’Curry Drop-In Center in Albany where the 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 city politics. As a council member, he is known for condescending dismissal of view-points of the public and fellow council members that differ from his own and has exhibited a pattern of substituting his personal surmises and preferences 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 demonstrate 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 Destin
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 candidates need to both consider our recommendations and to do their own homework in deciding which candidates best represent their views and goals. Green Party questionnaires were sent to all candidates; three returned the questionnaires; candidate Jacob Clark declined to respond. The candidates’ complete Green Party questionnaire responses can be viewed at http://agreens.org.

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 Masters 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 environmental and social justice, and a commitment to more thoughtful analysis of the city budget and Albany’s place in a regional economy. He does not specifically state support for some of the key values of the Green Party, an emphasis on the health of business and community-based economics as a Green institutional to overturn corporate constitutional rights and get limits. He also pledges to revisit Albany’s living wage ordinance and introduce appropriate minimum wage legislation if re-elected.

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 their treatment of issues, and emphasize as a top priority working with the Solano Ave. Association and Albany Chamber 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 “the constitutional amendment process is contrast to the constitutional 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 has to come from somewhere. Unfortunately, many of our candidates lack a strong understanding of the preferences and staff proprieties. 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 already collects. Funding for 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 will also fund the city’s new 911 dispatch system, which does not pass, the City will lose millions of already approved tax revenue—forcing drastic cuts in city services.

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 presumes “a robust” public process through the Public Works Commission and the Parks and Waterfront Commission. Just about any repair, renovation or replacement of a facility could be funded, including sidewalks, storm drains, green infrastructure to prevent flood- ing, senior centers, park improvements recreation facilities, and buildings and preservatories. The interest on these property taxes by $21.27 per $100,000 assessed valuation.

The City certainly needs a lot of work, and the money should remain local has been primarily expressed by those who advocate an insular attitude and have objected to the council wrestling in important national and state issues where community members believe local government is an effective measure. While this might not be the intended meaning of candidate Giesen-FIELDS’s statement, its echo of the positions of other local elected who have eschewed personal and global responsibility seems unbalanced.

Amber Whiston has been a participant in Albany politics primarily regarding homelessness issues. Her questionnaire reflects a commitment to fair and sensitive treatment of the homeless and those in need of social services. She applauded her advocacy for realizing the vision of a Paul O’Curry Drop-In Center in Albany where the 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 city politics. As a council member, he is known for condescending dismissal of viewpoints of the public and fellow council members that differ from his own and has exhibited a pattern of substituting his personal surmises and preferences 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 demonstrate that he does not have the temperament or judgment needed for public service.

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 candidates need to both consider our recommendations and to do their own homework in deciding which candidates best represent their views and goals. Green Party questionnaires were sent to all candidates; three returned the questionnaires; candidate Jacob Clark declined to respond. The candidates’ complete Green Party questionnaire responses can be viewed at http://agreens.org.

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 Masters 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 environmental and social justice, and a commitment to more thoughtful analysis of the city budget and Albany’s place in a regional economy. He does not specifically state support for some of the key values of the Green Party, an emphasis on the health of business and community-based economics as a Green institutional to overturn corporate constitutional rights and get limits. He also pledges to revisit Albany’s living wage ordinance and introduce appropriate minimum wage legislation if re-elected.
Measure W1 - YES Citizens Redistricting Commission

This is a charter amendment which would establish a Citizens Redistricting Commission (CRC) to draw Berkeley’s 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 partisanship and region as possible in an inherently political process. Any Berkeley citizen who has voted in the last two elections may apply to serve on the CRC, with some requirements that the mayor, city council members, 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 represent the districts for their final year. City council members will 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 with some exceptions, like recent office holders and city ballot. Arguably, 16 and 17 year olds as a group know more than you think. So, join two other US cities and a host of other countries and regions to allow young people to vote for those who want to change the way we approach homelessness, 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 increase tenant protections. The new ordinance, if passed, 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 for families that are evicted, and extends protections to all tenant households (not just low-income) forced to move out. Low-income, disabled, age 60 or older, or long-term tenants 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 City 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 campaign funding. 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 of modest means spend to wage 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 Portland, Seattle, Chicago 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. Arguably, 16 and 17 year olds as a group know more about what going on with their schools than anyone else, and are as mature as other young adults in making the decisions required to vote responsibly. The State Constitution would have to be amended to lower the voting age before a local ordinance could be enacted. A bill in the legislature to do that did not make it out of committee this session. Vote YES for another small step for representative democracy.

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 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 Sponsored measure, and a YES vote on CC, the citizen’s initiative supported by labor, the NAACP, and Councilmembers Anderson, Arreguin and Worthington. How 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 that a majority of Berkeley voters 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 by a simple majority? Don’t be so confident that 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 and is running for his second term, 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-time residents—almost 1500 people/year—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:

http://acgreens.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 as who you do. Jesse Arreguin 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 else you vote for, DON’T vote for Capitelli.

Although we are not endorsing him, we also recommend: Berkeley’s Instant Run-off Voting (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 but #1 or #2, 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, NO MOORE

Nanci Armstrong-Temple and Cheryl Davila are both running as progressive candidates for the unopposed, winner-take-all race. Cheryl Davila is a progressive candidate backed by the community-friendly record of incumbent Darryl Mood. Both Nanci and Cheryl are community activists who care about District 2, the City, and the County. Both candidates respond to our questionnaire and have articulate positions on police accountability, responsible development and affordable housing, along with anti-displacement policies as key to their messages. You can read their responses here:

https://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires

Nanci Armstrong-Temple has been sole endorsed by Berkeley Citizen Action, the Berkeley Progressive Alliance, Berkeley Tenants Union, and the Berkeley Democratic Club. Both she and Cheryl are trying to shake how they know enough (i.e., read the voter pamphlet) that neither passes by a simple majority? Don’t be so confident that 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 and is running for his second term, 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-time residents—almost 1500 people/year—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:

http://acgreens.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 as who you do. Jesse Arreguin 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 else you vote for, DON’T vote for Capitelli.

Although we are not endorsing him, we also recommend: Berkeley’s Instant Run-off Voting (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 but #1 or #2, 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, NO MOORE

Nanci Armstrong-Temple and Cheryl Davila are both running as progressive candidates for the unopposed, winner-take-all race. Cheryl Davila is a progressive candidate backed by the community-friendly record of incumbent Darryl Mood. Both Nanci and Cheryl are community activists who care about District 2, the City, and the County. Both candidates respond to our questionnaire and have articulate positions on police accountability, responsible development and affordable housing, along with anti-displacement policies as key to their messages. You can read their responses here:

https://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires

Nanci Armstrong-Temple has been sole endorsed by Berkeley Citizen Action, the Berkeley Progressive Alliance, Berkeley Tenants Union, and the Berkeley Democratic Club. Both she and Cheryl are trying to shake their responsive trend report on police accountability, responsible development and affordable housing, along with anti-displacement policies as key to their messages. You can read their responses here:

https://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires

Nanci Armstrong-Temple has been sole endorsed by Berkeley Citizen Action, the Berkeley Progressive Alliance, Berkeley Tenants Union, and the Berkeley Democratic Club. Both she and Cheryl are trying to shake
Berkeley City Offices and Measures

Berkeley City Council, District 6
Defeat Wengraf!

#1: Fred Dodsworth
#2: Isabelle Gaston

Berkeley City Council, District 3

#1: Ben Bartlett (ranked, but not endorsed)
#2: Mark Coplan (ranked, but not endorsed)
#3: Al Murray (ranked, but not endorsed)

Don’t vote for Matthews

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 neighborhood beautification, implementation of the Citywide Complete Action Plan, enhancing sustainable transportation models in public transit, walking, cycling; and hiring responsible city staff. He is a retired US Environmental Protection Agency administrator and served on many EPA commissions. He has very good positions on most issues. We recommend ranking him #3.

Realtor Debbie 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 serving 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”—conservatives 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. We gave her an expansive detailed response to our questionnaire such that we could in no way justify her position. We encourage you to read it here: https://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires/

We are happy to endorse him.

Berkeley Rent Board

Igor Tregub, Christina Murphy, Alejandro Soto-Vigil, and Leilah 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, Leilah Simon-Weisberg, and Igor Tregub – the Green slate. These four candidates have a comprehensive, progressive record. Her single opponent is Stephen Murphy, the current chair of the Planning Commission. He represents a continuation of the status quo developer-friendly Council and is solidly backed the developer friendly/anti-homeless city council structure. We recommend ranking him #1.

Ken Bukowski is a former journalist and small businessman, 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. His questionnaire responses are a delight, and you can read them here: https://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires/.

We are happy to endorse him.

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.

Ken Bukowski was the other hand gave us pause. 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 PFPQ 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 council meetings and supporting community building. It is likely that he would side with the incumbents.

Berkeley School Board

No Endorsement

Judy Appel and Beatriz Layra-Cutler are running for re-election. Judy Appel has a long track record and has only one challenger, Abdur Sikder, who has kids in the Berkeley schools. What little we could find about him was not encouraging, and the incumbents are likely to win by landslides. Both incumbents have endorsed Laurie Capellini 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.

Emeryville City Offices and Measures

Emeryville continued from page 1

vast experience actualizing progressive policy on housing, homelessness and the dispossessed, as well as having served as an attorney representing this population during a former career. He presently serves on the Emeryville Planning Commission. Ally Medina has been a community organizer for the past decade, has been employed in a leadership position in the San Francisco Democratic Party, and is now a native and environmental attorney, currently representing homeless and the dispossessed, as well as having served as an advocate for families. She is a long time resident of Emeryville, whose dedication and service to the city are admirable. We felt that in this field of candidates she lacked the policy making experience of our choices, though her grassroots experience is impressive. Registered Republican Louise Engel did not respond to our questionnaire. We hope that John Van Geffen will serve on committees in the coming year that will better acquaint him with Emeryville.

School Board

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, who are 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 expressed a strong interest in 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-starved Emery.

Ken Bukowski is the other hand gave us pause. 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 PFPQ 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 myriad 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 on the other hand gave us pause. 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 PFPQ 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 myriad 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 on the other hand gave us pause. 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 PFPQ 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 myriad 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 on the other hand gave us pause. 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 PFPQ 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 myriad 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 on the other hand gave us pause. 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 PFPQ 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 myriad 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 Bernice Lee, our 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 for much of South County (however, 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://agreens.wordpress.com/voter-guides/.

**Hayward Measure EE - YES Cannabis Tax Authorization**

Measure EE is similar to other measures on the ballot in November to place additional city taxes (not exceeding 15 percent) on the sale of medical and recreational cannabis — if the sale of cannabis is approved by California voters in November to place additional city taxes (not exceeding 15 percent) on the sale of medical and recreational cannabis — if the sale of cannabis is approved by California voters in November to place additional city taxes (not exceeding 15 percent) on the sale of medical and recreational cannabis. It seems a pretty clever way to construct or acquire 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.
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**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 contexts 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’ union, 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 would only benefit certified 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 continued on next page
because of this parcel tax could merit support). Some OEA members decry having to pay money to a parcel tax as homeownners and say they can’t afford it but actually the $10 is a small fraction of the benefit they would receive.

It is true that those who do not live within Oakland would see a larger benefit than those who are homeowners within Oakland.

Those who are opposed to any regressive tax say that this surely is one. The OEA pushed to have a square-foot tax that would be a revenue source for the city, but the committee did not think that was legally viable.

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 express intention 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 unity of all OUSD unions.

Allocations of money will only go to students who are residents of Oakland and charter 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?

Some parents are concerned charter school parents 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, only those at the table designing this 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 verboten, 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 reframing the Oakland proposed tax on sugar-sweetened beverages (such as soda) to a “grocery tax” which could 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 unan- imous vote of the Oakland City Council. The proposed tax would join Berkeley, which in 2014 became the first Bay Area city to adopt such a tax. Sales of soda and other sugary bever-
ages have fallen in Berkeley, a result of not only the higher cost, but also the increased education of the health dangers connected with sugar,” according to the SF Chronicle article of 5/4/16. 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 education 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 toward the general fund, and only a majority vote is needed to pass the tax, we endorse this measure.

This measure seeks to stop or curtail the use of sugary drinks. While this is a good thing, our concern is that this measure punishes the poor (if the retailer raises the price of the sugary drinks) and doesn’t go far enough in promoting health and healthy food choices in poor neighborhoods.

The goal ought to be to increase 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 healthy food right. Black and brown health for Oaklanders, rather than just rendering unhealthy and addictive foods more expensive. Despite these concerns, we endorse HH measure.
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Don’t vote for Moore
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City Council At-Large

#1: Matt Hummel
#2: Rebecca Kaplan

(ranked, but not endorsed)

Don’t vote for Moore

The incumbent, Rebecca Kaplan, has served two 4-year terms and is not running again. She is the first African American woman to sit on the Oakland City Council and has been serving since 2014. She is running for her third term.

Don’t vote for Moore is an initiative that was started by Matt Hummel and Peggy Moore, Bruce Quan, and Nancy Sibleyboth.

City Council At-Large

#1: Matt Hummel
#2: Rebecca Kaplan

(ranked, but not endorsed)

Don’t vote for Moore

The incumbent, Rebecca Kaplan, has served two 4-year terms and is not running again. She is the first African American woman to sit on the Oakland City Council and has been serving since 2014. She is running for her third term.

Don’t vote for Moore is an initiative that was started by Matt Hummel and Peggy Moore, Bruce Quan, and Nancy Sibleyboth.

City Council At-Large

#1: Matt Hummel
#2: Rebecca Kaplan

(ranked, but not endorsed)

Don’t vote for Moore

The incumbent, Rebecca Kaplan, has served two 4-year terms and is not running again. She is the first African American woman to sit on the Oakland City Council and has been serving since 2014. She is running for her third term.

Don’t vote for Moore is an initiative that was started by Matt Hummel and Peggy Moore, Bruce Quan, and Nancy Sibleyboth.

City Council At-Large

#1: Matt Hummel
#2: Rebecca Kaplan

(ranked, but not endorsed)

Don’t vote for Moore

The incumbent, Rebecca Kaplan, has served two 4-year terms and is not running again. She is the first African American woman to sit on the Oakland City Council and has been serving since 2014. She is running for her third term.

Don’t vote for Moore is an initiative that was started by Matt Hummel and Peggy Moore, Bruce Quan, and Nancy Sibleyboth.

City Council At-Large

#1: Matt Hummel
#2: Rebecca Kaplan

(ranked, but not endorsed)

Don’t vote for Moore

The incumbent, Rebecca Kaplan, has served two 4-year terms and is not running again. She is the first African American woman to sit on the Oakland City Council and has been serving since 2014. She is running for her third term.

Don’t vote for Moore is an initiative that was started by Matt Hummel and Peggy Moore, Bruce Quan, and Nancy Sibleyboth.

City Council At-Large

#1: Matt Hummel
#2: Rebecca Kaplan

(ranked, but not endorsed)

Don’t vote for Moore

The incumbent, Rebecca Kaplan, has served two 4-year terms and is not running again. She is the first African American woman to sit on the Oakland City Council and has been serving since 2014. She is running for her third term.

Don’t vote for Moore is an initiative that was started by Matt Hummel and Peggy Moore, Bruce Quan, and Nancy Sibleyboth.
City Attorney
No Endorsement

Incumbent City Attorney Barbara Parker is the only candidate on the ballot. Four years ago, when we opposed Parker’s lone opponent, we wrote that Parker needed to move further away from the “business-as-usual” Democratic Party machine politics which continue to drag Oakland down, so we’re not able to give her our endorsement.

Unfortunately, Parker is still stuck in “business-as-usual” mode. We’re not sure what she’s doing to work towards 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 critically criticized the City Attorney’s office on the issue. The East Bay Express wrote that Parker’s “repeatedly waited until the last minute to assign private attorneys to handle police misconduct cases” and, “repeatedly failed to hire attorneys to handle 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 charters amendment. So maybe that’s why Parker avoided giving any direct answer to us, when we asked her in our question-and-answer what she thought the independent police commission 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 previous candidate Ben Lang as well as Wiginton. District 3 includes the bulk of West Oakland, which historically has been the center of the African American community. It is a community with high rates of unemployment and a high demand for affordable housing. It has also 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), and she has worked with low income youth. She has served with the West Oakland Police Department and has worked with the lone progressive Board member, Shanti Gonzalez, as well as another progressive Board member, Jody London, both of whom we oppose.

Jody London, being an insider, with reservations, is an electoral bureaucracy. He has also opposed the “Trojan horse,” “equity pledge,” and the “troditional approach not just in a general sense, but around curriculum and non-profit charters where she is not grounded and his involvement in current grassroots enterprises. This lack of experience may present a risk to her success as a councilmember. However, given McElhaney’s track record, we endorse Noni Scheme 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 is aligned with a larger movement to privatize agenda; they boosted her in the last election and she is aligned with the Green Party and the ten key values. I hope to encourage the voters of our top candidate to consider listing Lang as a second choice.

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 Oakland Public School Teachers Association (OPSA) has endorsed the incumbent for the District 5 Council seat.

This brings us to Nehanda Imara; she is an electoral neophyte, but has been involved with many grassroots groupings, such as ACCE, Just Cause, EBASE and others, and she is aligned with Green values. She has been a leader in Community, Education, and Justice and has been working with the community to stop the building of a polluting cementrairum in East Oakland. She is a self-defined revolutionary, and a member of the All African Revolutionary Party. She also has been endorsed by the Oakland Justice Coalition. She would speak truth to power.

If you are a Molotov voter guide continued from page 12
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vantage in a District which includes the Fruitvale, Hutchin-
son, and is one of the most depressed, deindustrialized areas of Oakland, especially the flatland community. Harris grew up in the community and has been a parent and edu-
cator (outside the public schools). More critically, he was a
founding board member of Great Oakland (GO) Public
Schools, which is the primary organization pushing pro-
corporate policies in the city, advocating for more private
involvement, charters, and standardized testing.

Recently, he has been the school board president and a
uncritical yes man for the Superintendent Antwan Wilson;
one service. The current tax would expiring in 2019. This
enrollment policy, which Wilson advocated without even
a formal board vote. Likewise, Harris has not in any way
questioned charters or the expansion of the downtown
bummer.

Jackson in contrast has a much more positive history, advokating for community college students, co-authoring
a Green Job Dilemma. Some say that the only reason for the
huge expenditure on these imported busses—at a time when
there is no official opposition, it needs
to pay attention to the budget and asks probing questions
about it.

He serves as a pro-AC transit and is free for a number of years, and most importantly, did so after the Van Hool bus boodoomage, 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 AC 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 AC Transit’s representative on the Trans-
 bay Task Force for Water Transit in the Bay Area. Director
Harper earned 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
endorsed Capitelli, who represents the anti-bus, pro-
developer city power structure. While Harper is good
on AC Transit issues, he is sometimes disappointing in
other areas.

Our opponent, Russ Tittleman, 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
(abshowfortheluture.org) which he calls a “virtual bus lane”
(though a lack of a bus lane is not a problem). His plan is really
planning those for some of their route improvements.

Measure RR – YES, with standard bond reservations

BART Infrastructure Bond
BART’s hundreds of thousands of riders are well aware
that the system needs major repairs and rebuilding. Measure
RR would raise the $3.5 billion, with 90 percent of the tax
used for repairing repayment programs. Parts of the roll sys-
tem, such as track replacement, electrical system upgrades,
repairs to tunnels and other structures, replacement of the
alignment and stations, and signalization, need to be fixed.

“Smart Cohen, executive of TransForm, a transit ad-
vocacy group that has been critical of BART’s spending
priorities for the past two decades, said the bond measure
is evidence that the transit system has mended its ways and
is focused on rejuvenating the system,” as quoted in the SF
Chronicle on 6/10/16. “We think BART is absolutely headed
towards the right direction. This is not a porkulus bill, the direc-
tors voted to place the bond measure on the ballot.

The BART district that built and operates the system has
taxing authority only for Alameda, Contra Costa, and San Francisco counties. So only those three counties will
vote on the measure. A two-thirds majority will be needed.
If passed, the bonds would be financed by property tax bills
on district property, 
the nuts
and bolts of repair, including 
the underground components, and would be payable over 35 to 55 years for thirty years. As always, we wish the wealthy corporations who benefit greatly from the BART system would pay more of the cost, but the BART Board had to attempt what is possible under our current laws.

For more details about the content see the website
yesforbart.com, where you will also find the endorsements,
including the League of Women Voters Bay Area, Sierra
Club (San Francisco Bay Area Chapter), many Democratic
Clubs, many elected officials, and several unions. We also recommend voting YES on RR.
BART Board, District 5
John McPartland
This race is between the incumbent, John McPartland, and one challenger, Jennifer Hosterman. 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 Hosterman is a former mayor of Pleasanton. Her home base is in the more conservative areas of the District, and some of her positions are inconsistent with more progressive conservative ideas. Electing directors more supports candidates to cater to conservative 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. For candidates running, meaning the two minor candidates could have an effect in a close election. The two main 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 workers), 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. Rolland 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 District 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.

Keni 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 Chabot gun club down sooner than it actually was.

But of the four, we found that we resonated more with answers from Audre 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 in 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 District 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 priorities and positions 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 and away the most progressive leaning of the 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 elected. We give Daniel Chesmore a strong endorsement in this race.

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 twice 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:

- Rental Housing Development: $425mil, most at 30-60 percent AMI
- for Rental Housing Program: $45mil, target 60-120 percent AMI
- Homeowner Preservation 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 from before 1973
- Homelessness & Opportunity Fund: $35mil, to possibly acquire apartment buildings on the market

(*) reference household:
1 to 4 persons: 30 percent AMI = $22k to $33k
5 to 8 persons: 53k to $75k
120 percent AMI = $82k to $117k

Issues:
1) Estimates of spending are not delineated.

2) The County stated that this money will stay in the county. Yes, but a majority MAY be spent on the non-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 target they have no endorsements and no campaign funds. We endorse John McPartland.

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 progressive supports it, the poor only get crumbs and it doesn’t provide enough help to our growing increase.

We recommend a “no” vote on A1 unless you are in favor of supporting the people who rent the Bay Area, and who are all 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 priorities and positions 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 and away the most progressive leaning of the 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 elected. We give Daniel Chesmore a strong endorsement in this race.

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

Info at: http://groups.yahoo.com/group/AnnouncementsGPC
Proposition 51 - NO
School Bonds, K-12 and Community College Liabilities and 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 to get real estate spruced up.
That said, this measure would provide $9 billion, supposed 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 negative 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 groupings, 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) and that imposes 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 the state’s health care program.
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 specific; thus this is where it should be used for.
The only statement of opposition we could find is SEIU and the opposition is only on principle, not against the purpose of the measure, according to the proponents of Prop. 52. It includes labor unions, business groups and members of both political parties. But one union representing hospital workers, the Service Employees International Union-United Healthcare Workers West (SEIU-UHW), says its initiative is a “money grab” by the hospitals. It says to everybody... these tax dollars 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 appropriate venue for deciding how to use the money raised. Lawmakers 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 stated an opposition to Prop. 52.
Proponents include the California Teachers Association, Californians for Quality Education, California Hospital Association, Solano County Supervisors, and the California Democratic Party. Top donors supporting the measure (as of April 5, 2016) included California Health Foundation and Trust, Dignity Health, St. John’s Health, Children’s Hospital of Los Angeles and many other medical centers and hospitals.
Our concerns with this measure, despite its socially constructive goals for youth, are centered on low-income people, revolves around the role of the California Hospital Association, not just regarding financial support for the campaign but the measure itself. It is going to bail out, including the private sector, linked to this federal funding, and regarding adequate accountability for the money.
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” 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 Carpopatis. Other political supporters include the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association.
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 ballot met an overwhelming resistance (by state agencies) and was ultimately approved. Because of this, it could be viewed as a vanity initiative promoted by one wealthy farmer couple. Dean Carpopatis’s stated motive is to control state debt. Although it cannot be used to inject direct democracy 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 the following. 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 would be available for public purposes.
We give a conditional thumbs up on this one. This bill seems on the face of it quite reasonable and innocuous, and “hearing” for determining what is in fact the “purposes” of a bill is actually a ‘money grab’ by the hospitals. It says to everybody... these tax dollars 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 appropriate venue for deciding how to use the money raised. Lawmakers 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 stated an opposition to Prop. 52.
Proponents include the California Teachers Association, Californians for Quality Education, California Hospital Association, Solano County Supervisors, and the California Democratic Party. Top donors supporting the measure (as of April 5, 2016) included California Health Foundation and Trust, Dignity Health, St. John’s Health, Children’s Hospital of Los Angeles and many other medical centers and hospitals.
Our concerns with this measure, despite its socially constructive goals for youth, are centered on low-income people, revolves around the role of the California Hospital Association, not just regarding financial support for the campaign but the measure itself. It is going to bail out, including the private sector, linked to this federal funding, and regarding adequate accountability for the money.
That said, we still believe it is a positive program in our non-single-payer world.

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 valuable services. However, major fiscal measures are rarely easy to pass. In this case, one would not label it of “with reservation,” but rather “with complicating issues.”
This initiative is largely a renewal of the much higher profile Prop. 30, 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 (California Federation of Teachers), called for a “Millionaire’s tax” (Prop. 30); the other was led by Governor Brown, raising incomes 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 ran into a similar vigorous 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 political trade-offs. In the case of Prop. 30, the aforementioned “MT” was much more grassroots; more problematic was the referral 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 advocacy for programs serving the public interest, such as the homeless, elderly, and impoverished 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 for schools and health care, but the “reign 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 $34 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 “reign of Prop. 13,” it would correct one of its most grievous aspects.

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 increase the tax by $2.00 per pack, with an equivalent increase on other tobacco products, including electronic cigarettes containing nicotine.
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 does not cover the cost of treatment.
The remaining funds would go to tobacco use prevention, education and control programs, tobacco-related disease treatment, smoking cessation programs, and law enforcement to prevent interstate smuggling.
If the higher tax does lead to decreased tobacco consumption (which is the primary motive), it would be transferred to already existing tobacco-tax-funded programs.
The proponents and funders are primarily health care organizations, and they would be the usual right-wing anti-tax groups, including ones associated with the infamous ALEC 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 more in closer to election day.

Past increases in tobacco taxes have helped to dramati-
Proponents of Prop. 227, 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 classrooms. Found in Washington State, 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 providing the necessary opportunities to build the curricular respect of their cultural identities and providing language continuity to their children.

In short, the Green Party controls many of the services, 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. If 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 provide the ridiculous notion that limitless corporate donations to classrooms and poor bilingual programs that existed prior to Prop. 227. Let’s hope the passage of Prop. 58 does not result in throwing out the baby with the bathwater.

**State Propositions**

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

Prop. 57 has main text parts, page 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 youth at risk 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, but only for “approved rehabilitation or educational achievements.”

The California District Attorney’s Association states, in opposition, “California could see inmates serving as little as a single year in prison for violent offenses, sentences that are not supported by the California Supreme Court in any scenario harbingers by Marcy’s Law.” The Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism supports Prop. 57, and sees things differently: “Today, California’s prisons are under a court-ordered population cap. Without a common sense, fiscally responsible plan, the court could order the arbitrary release of prisoners. This is an unacceptable outcome that puts Californians in danger.”

Section 4 abolishes what is known in juvenile law as “direct filing,” in which a prosecutor can file a criminal charge against a person under age 18 in adult court without a formal finding by a juvenile court. Prop. 57, in the words of Prop. 21 both expanded the mandatory filing to include some minor 14 and older, and added discretionary direct filing allowing prosecutors to file in adult court in a variety of circumstances. A good presentation of the evolution and complications of direct filings can be found in Jean G. V. Sugarman Court (2013) 20 Cal.App.4th 1480 at pp. 1487-1490.

If Prop. 57 passes, in order for a minor to be tried in adult court, the court will have to determine that there is a “substantial and compelling” reason to try the minor as an adult. 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, improved their conversational skills, understanding, 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 be taught in English or any other language in 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 registration, even if their children had already signed up for all English classes. What they were signing, in order to continue offering bilingual classes, especially in the lower grades. Prop. 58 eliminates the need for waivers.

**Proposition 59 - YES Campaign Finance, Regulate “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. CA/OSHA has long been fighting for “rule making” authority, which could potentially be used to “small” producers if the initiative passes. The other twist is one that could potentially be used 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 proposition to be held to standing to defend the law if the state does not.

The main proponent of Proposition 21, the AIDS Healthcare Foundation, the largest nonprofit organization serving HIV/AIDS patients worldwide; Beyond AIDS; the American Sexual Health Association; the National Abortion Federation; and the California Nurses Association, the California Medical Association (CMA), and the American Nurses Association, the California Nurses Association (CNA) make the case that Prop. 8 would amend the California Labor Code to require production of anyone in the state of California to pursue violations through a private right of action (i.e. bring a law suit) if Cal/OSHA fails to follow through on a complaint. The Internet has (apparently) made it possible and sometimes necessary for performers to self-produce. The Internet can be an ugly place. Many of these producer/filmmakers/fear that this provision will leave them legally sanctioned harassment of themselves and their performers to self-produce. The Internet can be an ugly place. Many of these producer/filmmakers/fear that this provision will leave them legally sanctioned harassment by stalkers and others with moral objections to pornography. The proponents claim this can’t happen. If this does prove possible, it is an unintended consequence: performers may be induced to keep their performers to self-produce. The Internet can be an ugly place. Many of these producer/filmmakers/fear that this provision will leave them legally sanctioned harassment by stalkers and others with moral objections to pornography. The proponents claim this can’t happen. If this does prove possible, it is an unintended consequence: performers may be induced to keep their performers to self-produce. The Internet can be an ugly place. Many of these producer/filmmakers/fear that this provision will leave them legally sanctioned harassment by stalkers and others with moral objections to pornography. The proponents claim this can’t happen. If this does prove possible, it is an unintended consequence: performers may be induced to keep their performers to self-produce. The Internet can be an ugly place. Many of these producer/filmmakers/fear that this provision will leave them legally sanctioned harassment by stalkers and others with moral objections to pornography. The proponents claim this can’t happen. If this does prove possible, it is an unintended consequence: performers may be induced to keep their performers to self-produce. The Internet can be an ugly place. Many of these producer/filmmakers/fear that this provision will leave them legally sanctioned harassment by stalkers and others with moral objections to pornography. The proponents claim this can’t happen. If this does prove possible, it is an unintended consequence: performers may be induced to keep their performers to self-produce. The Internet can be an ugly place. Many of these producer/filmmakers/fear that this provision will leave them legally sanctioned harassment by stalkers and others with moral objections to pornography. The proponents claim this can’t happen. If this does prove possible, it is an unintended consequence: performers may be induced to keep their performers to self-produce.

**Proposition 58 - YES Allows Bilingual Education**

Prop. 58 repeals most of Prop. 227, which passed by 11 million votes. Prop. 227 would have ended bilingual education, a program that has existed 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 in special “English immersion” class, maybe less. The pressure on CDE from the state would be to increase credits significantly in order to relieve prison overcrowding and build the capacity necessary to comply with Marcy’s Law. The Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism supports Prop. 57, and sees things differently: “Today, California’s prisons are under a court-ordered population cap. Without a common sense, fiscally responsible plan, the court could order the arbitrary release of prisoners. This is an unacceptable outcome that puts Californians in danger.”

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, improved their conversational skills, understanding, 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 be taught in English or any other language in 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 registration, even if their children had already signed up for all English classes. What they were signing, in order to continue offering bilingual classes, especially in the lower grades. Prop. 58 eliminates the need for waivers.

**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 crippled and non- compliance within the industry is common. This measure would amend the California Labor Code to require production of anyone in the state of California to pursue violations through a private right of action (i.e. bring a law suit) if Cal/OSHA fails to follow through on a complaint. The Internet has (apparently) made it possible and sometimes necessary for performers to self-produce. The Internet can be an ugly place. Many of these producer/filmmakers/fear that this provision will leave them legally sanctioned harassment by stalkers and others with moral objections to pornography. The proponents claim this can’t happen. If this does prove possible, it is an unintended consequence: performers may be induced to keep their performers to self-produce.
Prop. 61
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the National Nurses United, which endorsed Bernie Sand-
ers in the Democratic Party primary. We also “follow the
money.” This proposition threatens Big Pharma’s profits,
so there will be a very expensive blizzard of lies mailed
to voters and very expensive TV ads. The website http://Stop-
PharmaGreed.com states, “Federal records show drug and
medical-device manufacturers in 2015 made payments of
more than a quarter of a billion dollars that— in one way or
another— went directly or indirectly into the pockets of tens
of thousands of California doctors, even as the leadership
of the California Medical Association decided to oppose
Prop. 61, the November ballot measure to cap prescription
drug prices.
“T hereby and incestuous financial ties between the
drug industry and California doctors raise troubling ques-
tions about the California Medical Association’s (CMA)
decision to oppose Prop. 61,” said Garry South, chief strate-
gist for the Yes on Prop. 61:Californians for Lower Drug
Prices campaign.

Proposition 62 - YES, YES, YES! End the Death Penalty

H ave you been punished by “capital” long enough? At
the national, state and local level the Green Party opposes
the death penalty. The question of capital punishment has
less to do with whether those convic ted of horrific crimes
deserve to die than 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 penalty crimes could not be affor-
ded by their own attorney at trial. Court-appointed attorneys often
lack the experience necessary for capital trials and are
over-worked and underpaid.
2. The death penalty is discriminatory and is used dis-
proportionately 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 pros-
ceutorial 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 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-pen-
alty/us-death-penalty-facts/death-penalty-and-innocence)
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 pos-
session 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 restri-
cions. Prop. 63 would require all other purchasers of any am-
nuement, 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
exceptions. New York recently found a similar law to be
unconstitutional.
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 re-
line up with the violent and endless misusing their power. 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 striv-
ing 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 Fran-
cisco Greens and some civil rights groups. Prop. 63 is op-
posed by responsible gun-owners’ groups and even many
law-enforcement groups. NO ONE here needs semiauto-
matic weapons of war.

Proposition 65 - NO Carry-Out-Bags Measure from
the Plastics Industry

Out-of-state manufacturers of flimsy single-use plastic
bags are trying to confuse California voters. Acting through
a front outfit calling itself the American Progressive Bag
Alliance, they’ve invested millions of dollars in a cam-
campaign that carryout bag fees be turned over to the state Wildlife Conservation Board.
Regarding masses of pro-plastic, pro–Big Business,
big money political action committees, the proposition
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)
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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 Ashcraft or Vella.
- 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!

- Berkeley
- Mayor – #1 and #2: Jesse Arreguin and Kris Worthington, #3: Guy “Mike” Lee
- Don’t vote for Capitelli
- City Council, District 2 – #1: Nanci Armstrong-Temple, #2: Cheryl Davila, #3: MO 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
- Andgor Tregub, Vote for all #1
- * 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 6 – Noel Gallo, with reservations
- City Council, District 7 – Nehanda Imara. Don’t vote for Reid.
- City Attorney – No Endorsement, please see write-up
- School Board, District 1 – Don MacKlay
- School Board, District 3 – #1: Kharyshi Wiginton, #2: Ben Lang, with reservations.
- Don’t vote for Hodge.
- School Board, District 5 – #1: Mike Hutchinson, #2: Rosanna 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 – Dolleine Jones, with reservations
- BART, District 3 – Rebecca Saltzman, with reservations
- (Encouragement for Varun Paul)
- BART, District 5 - John McPartland
- BART, District 7 - Lenetteh Simon
- EBRPD, Ward 2 – Dee 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
- E1 - Berkeley Public Schools Educational Excellence Act of 2016 – Yes
- F1 - 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
- V1 - Berkeley GANN Prop. App. Streamline – 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 - Berkeley 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
- RR - BART Infrastructure Bond – Yes, with standard bond reservations
- RR - BART Infrastructure Bond – Yes

State Propositions
- 51 - School Bonds, K-12 and Community College: Limit Developers Fees - No
- 52 - State Fees on Hospitals, Federal Medi-Cal Matching Funds - Yes, with reservations
- 53 - Revenue Bonds Requiring Statewide Voter Approval - No
- 54 - Legislature and Legislation, Allows Time to Read Bills - Yes, with reservations
- 55 - Tax Extension on the Rich, for Education and Healthcare - Yes
- 56 - Cigarette Tax to Fund Healthcare, Tobacco Use Prevention, Research. - Yes
- 57 - Sentencing for Non-violent Crimes and Juvenile Criminal Proceedings - Yes
- 58 - Bilingual Education - Yes
- 59 - Campaign Finance, Repeal Citizens United - Yes
- 60 - Adult Films, Condoms - Very Strange, You Decide, please see write-up
- 61 - State Prescription Drug Purchases, Pricing Standards - Yes
- 62 - End the Death Penalty – Yes, Yes, Yes
- 63 - Firearms, Ammunition Sales – No, because retired cops are exempt
- 64 - Marijuana Legalization - Yes
- 65 - Carry-Out Bags Measure from the Plastics Industry - No
- 66 - Speed Up the Death Penalty – No, No, No!
- 67 - Uphold the Ban on Single-Use Plastic Bags - Yes

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: acgreens.org, and then click on the “Candidate Questionnaires” tab near the top of the page.
for the thinking voter

Election Day: November 8, 2016

Thursday October 6

Jill Stein
Green Party Presidential candidate

You are invited to attend two special events with
Jill Stein and Ajamu Baraka

Federal Offices
President and Vice-President
Jill Stein and Ajamu Baraka

State Senate and Assembly

For more info, visit http://acgreens.org

City of Oakland

City Council, District 5 – Sophie Hahn
City Council, At-Large – #1: Matt Hummel, #2: Rebecca Kaplan*
City Council – Christian Patz, John Bauters, and Ally Medina. Don't vote for Moore.
School Board – Barbara Inch; Ken Bukowski, with reservations

City Council, District 3 – Noni Session
City Council, District 7 – Nehanda Imara. Don't vote for Reid.
School Board, District 1 – Don Macleay

Jill Stein
Green Party Presidential candidate

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

Green Voter Card
Online version at:
http://acgreens.org

County Measures....................................... 15
State Senate and Assembly.......................... 4
State Propositions ....................... 1, 16 17, 18
Superior Court ......................... 9
Hayward Area ........................................... 10

City of Oakland ............... 1, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14

Federal Offices

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

County Measures....................................... 15
Voter Card ................................ 19, Back page
Special Districts......................................14, 15

Green Party of Alameda County
2022 Blake St. Berkeley, CA 94704 (510) 644-2293 FPPC ID #921297