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

Your Green Party

The things you value do “just happen” by themselves—make a commitment to support the Green Party. Call us to volunteer your time during this election season and beyond. Clip out the enclosed coupon to send in your donation today.

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

The Green Party of Alameda County is coordinating voting, 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:

Phone: (510) 644-2293
Website: www.acgreens.wordpress.com
Email lists: To join a discussion of issues and events with other active Greens, send an email to GreenPartyofAlamedaCounty-subscribe@yahoo groups.com (all one word, no spaces, but a dash between County- subscribe). To get occasional announcements about current Green Party of Alameda County activities send an email to: agreens1992@gmail.com.

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 not resolved differences that prevented us from agreeing on a position, or no position was warranted. We only endorse bond measures for essential public projects that are unlikely to be funded otherwise. Our endorsement “Yes, with standard bond reservations” reflects our position that funding through bonds is more costly and therefore less fiscally responsible than a tax.

We are looking for candidates that can help us re-activate an East County and a South County local. If interested, please text or phone Mandeepe Gill at: 650-204-1069.

Credites:

Our voter guide team includes: Peter Allen, David Arkin, Jan Arnold, Victoria Ashley, Bill Balderston, Dale Baum, Steve Breedlove, Paul Burton (page layout), Chris Finn, Mandeepe Gill, Dave Helle, Mike Hutchinson, Greg Jan, Ralph Kahn, Michael Kaufman, Tina Kimmel, Don Macleay, Bob Marsh, James McFadden, Paul Rea, Justin Richardson, Michael Rubin, Bob Scelford, John Setawsky, Larry Shoup, Phoebe Sorgen, Kent Sparling, Pam Spevakch, Lisa Stephens, and Joan Strasser.

Taxes, Bonds, Fiscal Responsibility and the Green Party

The Green Party’s commitment to being fiscally responsible is as important as our commitment to being environmentally and socially responsible. Given these values, we often endorse bonds and taxes with reservations. Why? Because structural inequities in the tax system make state and local taxes regressive and their basic property taxes.

Parcel taxes are often the same for large properties and low income parcels that 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 $13,000 pay 10.5 percent and those who average $2 million pay 8.7 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.

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 budgets, and weigh heavily given that, as reported 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 $13,000 pay 10.5 percent and those who average $2 million pay 8.7 percent.

Support Your Green Party!

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

In addition, our mailing and printing costs have significantly increased 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.
voting “No” to war after 9/11. Lee’s engaged progressive values and commitment to the work of the movement on many vital issues.

One of the significant donors includes corporations like Salesforce, Twitter, LinkedIn, and Google. These companies have provided millions of dollars in political donations. The importance of these donations cannot be overstated. They shape the political landscape and influence the candidates’ views and policies. The candidates are often beholden to these corporate interests, which can lead to conflicts of interest.

The election results and outcomes will be crucial for the future of democracy in the U.S. The Green Party and other progressive movements are fighting to ensure that the political system is representative of the people and not just the corporate elite. It is essential for voters to get involved, learn about the candidates, and support those who share their values. We must work towards a political system that reflects the will of the people, not corporate greed.
State Assembly, District 18
No Endorsement!

The Democratic Party incumbent, Rob Bonta, has held office since 2012 and is campaigning for reelection. Bonta submitted Senate Bill 10 (SB10), the bill which addresses pretrial services, pretrial release or detention. The California Public Defenders Association (CPDA) was one of the co-sponsors. The ACLU and the Ella Baker Center for Human Rights have withdrawn as co-sponsors and are now neutral. The CPDA was troubled by the amendments negotiated by Judicial Council, Chief Probation Officers and the Governor. The problematic amendments put risk assessment and supervision under control of the probation departments, allow local superior courts to decide which risk assessment instrument will be used leading to possible problems of racial bias and allow the expansion of preventative detention. However, SB10 will totally do away with money bail, with no endorsements listed on his website.

No Endorsements

State Supreme Court
Justices
Carol Corrigan and Leondra Kruger: Yes, with reservations

Two California Supreme Court justices, Carol Corrigan and Leondra Kruger, have been the target of unsuccessful recall efforts for his ties to the Alameda firefighters’ union. His opponent in this State Assembly reelection, Republican Stephen Slaunov, now has begun a recall effort against a current Alameda councilmember, a person of color, which just may be intended to damage the councilmember’s reputation among the voters. Slaunov is against rent control and states “I’m not aware of any minority in my district that doesn’t have full rights.” He has never held public office, is self-financing his candidacy, and as we go to press in late September, has no endorsements listed on his website.

Bonta has accepted corporate money, which helped him raise a total of $750,029 in 2017, of which he contributed no endorsements listed on his website. The Alameda Magazine’s article “Recall as a cudgel” notes that Bonta, a former Alameda Councilmember, had been the target of unsuccessful recall efforts for his ties to the Alameda firefighters’ union. His opponent in this State Assembly reelection, Republican Stephen Slaunov, now has begun a recall effort against a current Alameda councilmember, a person of color, which just may be intended to damage the councilmember’s reputation among the voters. Slaunov is against rent control and states “I’m not aware of any minority in my district that doesn’t have full rights.” He has never held public office, is self-financing his candidacy, and as we go to press in late September, has no endorsements listed on his website.

Bonta has accepted corporate money, which helped him raise a total of $750,029 in 2017, of which he contributed some to other Democratic office holders, including Oakland Mayor Libby Schaaf ($800) and State Assembly member Tony Thurmond, who is running for Superintendent of Public Instruction: who received two donations of $4,400 each. Bonta has also endorsed a controversial figure, Oak-land City Councilmember Desley Brooks, for reelection. He is a typical entrenched, institutional Democrat. For State Assembly, District 18: No Endorsement!
Peralta Community Colleges Board
Two races mostly in Oakland (also Piedmont)

The Peralta Community Colleges—Laney, Merritt, College of Alameda, and Berkeley City College—play a critical role in serving and educating some of the most vulnerable and working people, children of working people, and people of color. The Peralta Board of Trustees is elected to have ultimate responsibility for setting policy and overseeing finances for the Peralta District Office and its four colleges.

Many voters are aware of Peralta’s four colleges, but few know about the workings of the Peralta District Office and its Board of Trustees. In fall 2017, the successful community/student labor campaign to stop the Oakland A’s from building a new stadium on Peralta/Laney cast a spotlight how “the public” were left out of critical decisions that affect the District’s 37,000 students.

Two seats on the Peralta Board of Trustees are up for election, but only two Peralta races will be on the November ballot. One incumbent, Julina Bonilla, is running unopposed, and the Peralta Board opts not to pay the Alameda County Registrar of Voters (taxpayers in tens of thousands of dollars) for single-candidate races. Bonilla was first elected in 2014 to represent Peralta Area 7 (Emeryville, and parts of Oakland, including West Oakland, Temescal, North Oakland, Adams Point, Lake Merritt.)

The District is facing budget shortfalls, class cuts, declining enrollment, decry 50 year-old facilities with water damage and mold, broken sidewalks, bathrooms in disrepair, and outdated classrooms. Further, concerns abound about lack of accountability, poor budgeting decisions, misappropriation, and corruption on the part of the Chancellor and his Board supporters. These conditions do not provide students an adequate learning environment nor essential education programs and support services, including basic skills, vocational preparation, transfer for higher degrees, and life-long learning and growth.

Two long-time incumbents are being challenged by candidates supported by faculty, staff, students, community members, and labor—all calling for change. These are down-ballot races that many voters may never get to.

You can help bring new perspectives to the Peralta Board by checking your ballot to see whether it includes a Peralta Board race, voting for the challengers, and talking with your neighbors.

Peralta Board, Area 3
San Antonio, Fruitvale, Allendale, Brookdale, Maxwell Park, Seminary, Highland Park

Corean Todd

Challenger Corean Todd is running to “advocate for my community, public education, and family activism.” For over a decade, Todd served as the Oakland Chapter president of Parent Voices, a statewide advocacy group fighting for affordable child care, early childhood education and other support services for working families. Professionally, Todd has worked in the fields of subsidized child care placements and affordable housing.

Todd acknowledges that while Peralta’s faculty and staff do their best to support their students, a first priority those efforts are often undermined by District administrators and a majority on the Board of Trustees. She argues that “shared governance” must be the bedrock of how Peralta operates, and budgets should be developed with the full inclusion of shared governance participants: faculty, staff and students. The broader community must also be involved.

Todd points out that the community college system as a whole, has been able to operate by exploiting large numbers of part-time faculty who receive less pay per class and also do not have access to full medical and other benefits. She adds, “This is not fair.”

Todd believes that public institutions and public land must be preserved. She notes that “If some of Peralta’s land has been given away or sold at rock-bottom prices, Todd was against the construction of a new A’s stadium near Laney College. One reason, she explains, is the land is part of an ecosystem that includes delicate bird habitats and other fragile ecosystems.

Incumbent Linda Handy was first elected with support from faculty, staff, labor and community. In the 3 elections since, she has been opposed once. Her responses to the Green questionnaire show that she has helped to accomplish some things as a Peralta Trustee, but some comments were vague, incomplete, and contradictory. She wrote in her questionnaire, “I’m not in favor of selling or leasing college land for commercial development. Our land is a sacred trust for future generations, and the current dominant economic pressures are not sustainable. Nevertheless, Handy would not meet with community folks opposed to the A’s development. Further, many at Peralta were concerned Handy was found hand mercenary and unsupportive, even hostile.

Peralta Board, Area 5
Piedmont, and parts of Oakland: Upper Rockridge, Grand Lake, Eastlake, Park Blvd, Glenview, Trestle Glen, Crocker Highlands, Lincoln Highlands, Dimond, Laurel, Redwood Heights

Cindi Napoli-Albeiss Reiss

Challenger Cindi Reiss (https://www.cindireiss2018.com/) has been a full-time community college faculty member at West Valley College for 15 years; for five years before that she taught at other community colleges and has also taught in prison settings. She is involved in governance matters at West Valley and state-wide. She says, “We need board members who will provide the effective oversight to ensure that public monies are being spent for students transparently and with accountability. According to Reiss, Peralta resources are mismatched: too much is being spent on administrators and highly paid consultants. Citing the district’s budget crisis in the 2000s, Reiss believes there has been a loss in the public’s trust. She explains that currently the process of budget presentation, feedback, and approval is haphazard and does not respect a shared governance model. There is a need to cultivate a campus ethos by enacting participatory governance, collegial consultation, and a culture of respect and evidence.

Addressing the needs of three major populations of students—African American, Latinx, and Asian American—Reiss proposes to engage the “community” in community colleges by partaking in public/public partnerships that allow the community to feel like the Peralta Colleges are their gems. Regarding Peralta’s situation with the A’s, Reiss said it was an incredible expense of time, energy, and morale; leasing and selling college land is not part of the mission statement of the Colleges.

Incumbent William “Bill” Riley (http://billriley4trustee.com) is the senior member of the Peralta Board, first elected in 1998. Many faculty, staff, students, and community members would like to see him retire. His five terms (over 20 years!) have been undistinguished, and Peralta’s problems persist. In his questionnaire, Riley stated, “I am against selling Peralta public land for commercial development.” The PCCD is in the education business. As vice-president, I led the PCCD Board in opposing the Oakland Athletics proposal to build a stadium on Peralta Community College District’s property.” However, Riley did not make his position apparent to the public—or to community members opposed to the A’s proposed new stadium, who asked several times to meet with Riley to discuss the matter, but never received a response.

Peralta Colleges

Measure E - YES, with reservations

Parcel Tax for Instruction and Educational services

Measure E would extend Peralta Measure B, passed by voters in 2009, and Measure E over eight years, providing $8,000,000 annually. Measure E is not a tax increase but a continuation of an existing funding source. A parcel tax requires a 2/3 majority.

Measure E would continue providing the colleges of Alameda, Berkeley, Laney, and Merritt, funds that cannot be taken by the state to support available college education, including core academic programs to prepare students for university transfer and successful careers, by providing tutoring and teacher support shall Peralta Community Colleges District continue to work with internal and outside partners, no funds for administrator salaries, and all funds benefitting local colleges.

Given the economies of California’s funding, or lack thereof, of higher education, supporters of the community college mission to provide accessible and affordable education would want to vote for Measure E. California’s Legislative Analyst’s Office estimates that in 2017-2018, California Community Colleges received $12,866 per full-time equivalent student (FTES) from state, local, and federal sources. Peralta’s budget does not reflect this level of funding.

In 2017-2018 Peralta’s revenue, including the parcel tax and all other forms of non-financial aid (to provide the most generous total possible) was $203 million — under $11,000 for each student. This means that even with the parcel tax Peralta has about 16 percent less funding than the above Legislative Analyst Office’s “average.” If the parcel tax’s $8 million in local revenue is removed, Peralta falls to $10,388, or 19 percent less than the Legislative Analyst Office’s “average.” To be clear, with or without the parcel tax, Peralta’s reality is that it is an underfunded community college district in relation to the established “average.”

Thus Measure E is a not-so-supplemental local funding source on which the Peralta Colleges are dependent for part of their funding to operate; when factored in, the parcel tax revenue represents about 7.5 percent of Peralta’s current operating budget. Losing this money means losing classes, faculty, instructional aides and tutors – ultimately harming students.

A downside: A parcel tax—taxing every owner of a parcel of land the same set amount—is an inherently regressive form of taxation.

Further, the District’s administration’s budgeting and spending have long been a concern for Peralta faculty and staff. Recently, many questions and much criticism have been directed at Measure B spending. From 2012, when Measure B passed, to 2017, 87 percent of Measure B expenditures were “general expenditures” and nearly 80 percent were non-core expenses. But in 2014, misspending occurred, and it accelerated under a newly-appointed chancellor. Measure B spending became questionable and contentious — criticized by many for not using the parcel tax revenue on classroom instruction — as was held promised during the campaign for the tax’s passage in 2012. Instead much of the spending has been on full-time counselors, librarians, and staff that would otherwise have been paid out of Peralta’s so-called “General Fund” or regular revenue. Now, it looks like this matter is being addressed.

An opponent of Measure E, a retired Peralta faculty member who recently resigned from the Measure B oversight committee, is the only signer of the opposition statement which appears in the County’s voter guide.

continued on page 2
Measure G - YES, with reservations
Bonds, Property Tax for Renovation and New Construction

Measure G will allow the Peralta District to sell $800 million in bonds to wealthy investors to borrow funds “To upgrade aging classrooms, technology, science labs; expand job-training classrooms; and acquire, construct, repair sites/facilities/ equipment... with no funds for administrator salaries, audits and citizen oversight, and all funds used locally.”

For the District to pay off the bonds—plus interest—property taxpayers would pay a projected yearly tax rate of $24.50 per $100,000 of assessed valuation, for 40 years. A home-owner with an assessed valuation of $600,000 will pay about $1500 each year. This bond measure will raise $44.2 million annually.

The state provides almost no funding, relating only to infrastructure, building maintenance by per capita, and new capital projects. Most school districts need to resort to bond-funding to do any of the preceding.

The ballot argument against Measure G. But there is a problem: The bond rating firm Moody’s recently downgraded the financial status of the Peralta District from “stable” to “negative.” Moody’s took this action referring, among other things, to Proposition 13’s restrictions on the categories that can be taxed. The Alameda County Assessor has to meet this challenge.

Alameda County Assessor
Don’t vote for Jim Johnson

The Assessor locates all taxable property in the county, identifies ownership, and appraises all property subject to property taxation. This is a powerful position that is prone to corruption, self-dealing, business interests seizing control of the office, and sizable amounts of debt with variable interest rates.

Our priority is for people in our community to have access to good educational experiences at the Peralta College, and for the Administration to not aggravate the problems described above. Our hope for returning the District to a sound fiscal footing lies in increased public scrutiny, as well as the election of two new members of the Board members (please see the Peralta Board article above).

City of Alameda
Mayor Frank Mattarrese, with reservations

Three well-known candidates are running for mayor: incumbent Mayor Trish Spencer and incumbent Council members Frank Mattarrese and Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft.

Spencer voices some Green values and act on those principles in various ways. Mattarrese has the edge over his competitors based upon his 12 years of performance on the dais and answers to our questionnaire. He also does not elicit polarization of constituencies, as does Spencer and Ezzy Ashcraft. However, he’s not been as strong of a progressive as we’d like him to be, hence our reservations.

Norell, no bluster, Mattarrese has a proven track record of getting down to business and building consensus in order to make progress. His pragmatic and even-handed approach shows that he has the needed leadership style and demeanor required to best represent and restore balance to the City of Alameda. His environmental record on preserving and enhancing open space and wildlife habitat while supporting sustainable local economic development, better transportation choices, and social justice issues make him the well-rounded advocate best suited for the job of mayor. Mattarrese has earned a Green Party endorsement.

City Council
John Knox White

Five candidates are vying for two seats. Incumbent Jim Oddi, former Planning Board member John Knox White, and newcomer Robert Matz returned our questionnaire.

All three have good qualities, but Knox White receives our endorsement.

Knox White exhibits the knowledge and experience to serve the city well, after having served eight years on the Planning Board vetting major development projects at Alameda Point and former industrial sites along the city’s major waterfronts; his experience is critical for creating an efficient public transit and is a voice for social justice in Alameda. He has the know-how and perseverance in public policy formulation needed to make informed decisions.

We offer no suggestion on your second vote. Oddi shares positions we hold dear, but needs to be more careful on following city laws. He violated the Sunshine Ordinance when he read text messages during a council meeting and when he inappropriately tried to influence the selection of a new fire chief. While showing much promise, Matz lacks the track record and experience gained by serving on a board or commission before running for city council. The other two candidates did not even bother to seek a Green Party endorsement, and they carry downsides.

School Board
Gary Lynn

This contest is generating far less energy and controversy in Alameda than the city council or mayoral races. There are four candidates for two openings with two incumbents and two newcomers. Two candidates sent responses and two did not. The strongest is Gary Lynn, an incumbent, and the only candidate to respond in a timely way.

Gary Lynn has been a parent activist serving on the School Site Council. He has been trained in fiscal policy at UC Berkeley and has a concern with the impact of district property, including relating to housing. While accepting common core curriculum, Gary advocates for more teacher input in professional development.

Anne McKereghan also a incumbent, returned her questionnaire after receiving a letter from the superintendent and is not well received by educators.

The other two candidates are newcomers. The more prominent is Miana Bonta, spouse of state assemblyman Rob Bonta. While he is involved in the Alameda District, she has been active with education issues while working in Sacramento. He last candidate is Kevin Jordan, a former Oakland high school teacher who also has taught in Alameda. He is progressive and advocates against tracking; however, he has no real campaign.

The Alameda Education Association has decided not to make an endorsement. That said, with his positive experience and support from community activists, it is reasonable to call for a vote for Gary Lynn.

Healthcare District
Board Dennis Popalardo

The major question confronting the Healthcare District is how to prepare for the 2030 deadline for seismic retrofitting of the hospital. There are two candidates running for a single seat: the appointed incumbent, attorney Dennis Popalardo, and a challenger, Mike McMahon, who is a hospital manager. McMahon gave very brief answers to the questions in our questionnaire, and they didn’t give us the sense he’s prepared to really tackle the tough problems the Healthcare District faces. His website also doesn’t have very much info either. McMahon wants to be on the Board to educate the “community on how our tax dollars are being spent.” That’s fine as far it goes, but information about how spending will be made in the future, and especially regarding how to deal with the seismic retrofit question, don’t give us much confidence in McMahon’s abilities to adequately serve on the Board.

Popalardo, on the other hand, did provide substantial answers in his questionnaire. In particular, he believes the District “should be putting aside a portion of the parcel tax proceeds to plan for 2030, as well as having a dialogue with community leaders about the importance of maintaining a hospital in Alameda and how we will pay for it.” Popalardo also voted against the proposed 2018 budget because it didn’t set aside any money for 2030 seismic compliance, and he also “pushed for $1 million of parcel tax money to be held back in the most recent Health Care District budget,” to be earmarked for funding 2030 seismic compliance. Dennis Popalardo’s responses show that he’s far better qualified to hold the seat than his opponent. Vote for Dennis Popalardo.

Services Sales Tax
Measure F - No

Measure F is a half-cent sales tax increase. The city council and their successors would get close to $5 million per year to spend however they please. All of the funds potentially could be used to meet public employee benefit shortfalls. As with any sales tax, people who earn less pay a larger percentage of their income on consumer goods as compared to those who earn more. This tax measure is inherently unfair. Vote No.

Weak Rent Control
Measure K - No

Measure K is a well-funded effort by landlords to enshrine a weak rent control law in the city charter. It is more representative of the city council’s desire to continue profiting from updated and devoid of any rent control ordinance. Measure K allows landlords to evict up to 25 percent of their tenants a year without having a “just cause,” such as nonpayment of rent or disturbance to neighbors. The measure also has no mechanism to prevent landlords from increasing city rent ordinance. Measure K allows landlords to evict up to 25 percent of their tenants a year without having a “just cause,” such as nonpayment of rent or disturbance to neighbors. The measure also has no mechanism to prevent landlords from increasing city rent ordinance. Measure K allows landlords to evict up to 25 percent of their tenants a year without having a “just cause,” such as nonpayment of rent or disturbance to neighbors. The measure also has no mechanism to prevent landlords from increasing city rent ordinance. Measure K allows landlords to evict up to 25 percent of their tenants a year without having a “just cause,” such as nonpayment of rent or disturbance to neighbors. The measure also has no mechanism to prevent landlords from increasing city rent ordinance. Measure K allows landlords to evict up to 25 percent of their tenants a year without having a “just cause,” such as nonpayment of rent or disturbance to neighbors. The measure also has no mechanism to prevent landlords from increasing city rent ordinance. Measure K allows landlords to evict up to 25 percent of their tenants a year without having a “just cause,” such as nonpayment of rent or disturbance to neighbors. The measure also has no mechanism to prevent landlords from increasing city rent ordinance.
Crisis and the Remaking of Urban Governance,” and would presumably bring valuable insight to the board regarding the serious fiscal challenges facing the district.

Peggy McQuaid was a graduate of Albany High and the son of a retired teacher. Together, diversity and inclusivity advisory group, is a founding member of the ACT (Albany Coming Together) and on the PTA and VP of the Black Parent Engagement Group.

His responses to our questionnaire showed a strong alignment with Green Party Key Values. He noted the need to address problems introduced by technology, such as the disruption of mobile phones at Albany High; he supports exploring “blended” curriculums and a later start time for school, as well as a shift in the academic calendar to give students a “true break” over the Christmas/New Year time frame. He also noted a desire to see the school board work more regularly with other boards across the State, for teachers to have more access to the work being done in other districts, and to benefit from economies of scale gained by “reaching across organizational, jurisdictional and community borders.” For these reasons he earns our endorsement.

Ross Stapleton-Gray is an incumbent member of the AUSD board completing his first term. His responses to our questionnaire demonstrated his extensive background in Albany schools over the past 20 years. He has a solid grasp of the difficulties of the looming budget cuts, and the need to maintain competitive wages and benefits for teachers, and his responses went into great detail about current and future projects to bring the district into the 21st century instructional model, including the new improved building facilities, a later start time for High School, and collaboration with Khan Academy to give students a comprehensive classroom experience. We urge interested voters to read his very detailed responses on the Green Party website. Finally his key role in drafting the Quaker Institute for the Future project, along with Khan Academy would set a promising path for our students.

Clementina Durón is a retired educator with 30 years experience, half of that time as a bilingual teacher and the other half as principal at various levels. While she did not return a questionnaire this year, her responses to our 2016 questionnaire indicated a strong alignment with Green Party values, including an emphasis on diversity and environmental sustainability and earned her our endorsement for that race.

Brian L. Doss is a Job Developer. He is currently the Site Counselor at Marin School, an active member of the Green Party and Black Parent Engagement Group. He was a founding member of the ACT (Albany Coming Together) diversity and inclusivity advisory group, is a graduate of Albany High and the son of a retired teacher. While his responses to our questions showed an interest in keeping class sizes small, supporting programs for the diversity of learners in the district and exploring 21st century instructional models, those responses were short on specific details or proposals as to how to achieve these goals. He does have the endorsement of the current Mayor.

Sara Hinkey - We are unable to advise about this candidate since we were not provided no response to our questionaire, although several people well established in Albany city government have endorsed her. We note that she has a PhD from UC Berkeley in City and Regional Planning, with a dissertation titled “Governing the Broke-City Fiscal

Park.” Hill supports more bike, scooter and electric car sharing programs. On safety, Hill worries about right-wing extremists coming to Berkeley, along with ICE and police surveillance equipment, and he favors making the Police Chief, Fire Chief and City Attorney; this is the last time and again over the years she has betrayed progressives.

Our reservations stem from inequities created by Prop. 13 coupled with the state’s squeeze on local governments, and the need to use devices such as sales and parcel taxes to fill the shortfall. However, in light of similar rates in neighboring municipalities, we reservedly recommend a vote of YES.

Measur M - Yes, with Reservations

Special Parcel Tax

In 1998 Measure R established a Landscape and Lighting District to maintain and improve park and open space facilities, with funds that could not be taken by Sacramento, at a rate of $69 per parcel per year, providing $463,675 annually, for use of bonds that will be fully repaid Sept. 2019. These funds have been maintaining many amenities: City parks, ball fields, play structures, picnic areas and restrooms; vegetation management to prevent wildfires; creek habitat; and Albany Hall open space.

Measure M would continue this special parcel tax, but with a more progressive rate structure that varies by property type (thanks in part to lobbying efforts of council candidate Preston Jordan). It requires a 2/3 majority to be enacted. Were property assessments based on market value and not limited by Prop. 13, special parcel taxes such as these would not be necessary, but in this case voters can know their dollars are dedicated to protecting preserves and open space.

Measures L, M, and N

Albany has three measures on the ballot, and the Green Party supports them all, though with some reservations, discussed below. Measure N will amend the City Charter to make the City Treasurer an appointed rather than an elected position; it has no organized local opposition. The other measures extend current sales and parcel taxes; their benefits outweigh the regressive nature of these means of taxation.

Measure L - Yes, with Reservations

half-cent Sales Tax

Requiring a 50 percent plus one simple majority, approval of this measure will make an existing one-half cent transactions and use (sales) tax permanent, provid-

Measur N - YES

Appointed City Treasurer

This Charter Amendment would amend Section 3.01 of the Albany city Charter to change the City Treasurer from an elected to an appointed position, effective Dec. 10, 2020, or sooner if there is a vacancy.

Albany has already removed the elected offices of Police Chief, Fire Chief and City Attorney; this is the last time and again over the years she has betrayed progressives. However, in light of similar rates in neighboring municipalities, we reservedly recommend a vote of YES.

Measur N - YES

Appointed City Treasurer

This Charter Amendment would amend Section 3.01 of the Albany city Charter to change the City Treasurer from an elected to an appointed position, effective Dec. 10, 2020, or sooner if there is a vacancy.
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Berkeley City Auditor
Jenny Wong

The City Auditor, according to the City of Berkeley web page, provides an independent assessment of whether the city’s services and operations are: (1) being managed properly and efficiently by the city’s agencies and departments; and (2) achieving their objectives and desired outcomes; and (3) being provided efficiently, economically and effectively.

As the city watchdog, this is a big issue. We recommend Jenny Wong, a long-time Berkeley resident who has 18 years of experience in the government auditing field including the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO). Her expertise and public service credentials can be found here: https://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires

Jenny Wong has a long record of community service, is endorsed by the Berkeley Budget Auditors anderie Hoganson, a former Auditor Anna Ralikan, all the members of the Berkeley City Council, former mayor Gus Newport, and a long list that contains conservatives and progressives indicating this is not a partisan candidate.

We strongly advise against Vladislav Davidson who did not return our questionnaire and who is an unknown with no record of service in the city of Berkeley. His candidate statement is that he is for "keyans of commerce" so there is no list to indicate his supporters in the community. He lists his profession as “Chief Executive Officer” but fails to list what he is CEO of. His campaign document also includes “provide vouchers for housing outside the city for our homeless” indicating he favors shipping our homeless to other communities rather than providing local solutions – a gating strategy he is trying to work in the state as well as in the city. Lastly, his online comments in BerkeleySide indicate a strong pro-developer and conservative politics. Vote for Jenny Wong.

Berkeley City Council,
District 1

#1: Igor Tregub
#2: Mary Behm-Steinberg
#3: Margo Schueler, with reservations

Don’t vote for Kesarwani

This is the North Berkeley district which Councilmember Linda Maio served for over 25 years. Since Linda announced she would not run again, four candidates are running to replace her. The Green Party strongly endorses Igor Tregub for this seat for keyans of commerce” so there is no list to indicate his supporters in the community. He lists his profession as “Chief Executive Officer” but fails to list what he is CEO of. His campaign document also includes “provide vouchers for housing outside the city for our homeless” indicating he favors shipping our homeless to other communities rather than providing local solutions – a gating strategy he is trying to work in the state as well as in the city. Lastly, his online comments in BerkeleySide indicate a strong pro-developer and conservative politics. Vote for Jenny Wong.

Berkeley City Council,
District 4

#1: Jenny Wong

Berkeley City Auditor
Jenny Wong

The City Auditor, according to the City of Berkeley web page, provides an independent assessment of whether the city’s services and operations are: (1) being managed properly and efficiently by the city’s agencies and departments; and (2) achieving their objectives and desired outcomes; and (3) being provided efficiently, economically and effectively.

As the city watchdog, this is a big issue. We recommend Jenny Wong, a long-time Berkeley resident who has 18 years of experience in the government auditing field including the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO). Her expertise and public service credentials can be found here: https://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires

Jenny Wong has a long record of community service, is endorsed by the Berkeley Budget Auditors anderie Hoganson, a former Auditor Anna Ralikan, all the members of the Berkeley City Council, former mayor Gus Newport, and a long list that contains conservatives and progressives indicating this is not a partisan candidate.

We strongly advise against Vladislav Davidson who did not return our questionnaire and who is an unknown with no record of service in the city of Berkeley. His candidate statement is that he is for "keyans of commerce" so there is no list to indicate his supporters in the community. He lists his profession as “Chief Executive Officer” but fails to list what he is CEO of. His campaign document also includes “provide vouchers for housing outside the city for our homeless” indicating he favors shipping our homeless to other communities rather than providing local solutions – a gating strategy he is trying to work in the state as well as in the city. Lastly, his online comments in BerkeleySide indicate a strong pro-developer and conservative politics. Vote for Jenny Wong.
necessary, the City of Berkeley can use eminent domain to take possession of its land. Despite launching a different measure, Berkeley School Board member Laverde says her coalitions-supported ballot measure to strengthen the Police Review Commission, which the City Council ultimately failed to pass in June, despite her best efforts, has little to show for in government or its commissions, and some found him inflexible when discussions of a police-accountability measure arose earlier this year. Tillman did not return our Green Party questionnaire so there are still questions about his policy positions on some issues.

Do not rank incumbent Lori Drotto who has failed progressively. She has taken pro-developer positions and anti-housing positions on legislation time and again. She voted against putting even the watered down version of the Police Review Commission charter amendment on the ballot, and this was a strong one in the movement for Urban Shaper, one of Berkeley’s most conservative Council members, favoring developers and police over constituents.

Vote Green Party endorsed Mary Kay Lacey #1. Please rank Tameka Tillman #3 (due to reasons listed above), and don’t rank Drotto at all. Mary Kay Lacey’s victory will be a victory for the people.

Berkeley School Board
Ty Alper, Ka’Dijah Brown, and Dru Howard

There are six candidates running for three seats for the Berkeley School Board. One is an incumbent, one served a short term as an appointed member of the Board, and two candidates, though not new to the District, are new to politics.

Ty Alper is the incumbent, and deserves your support. Vote for Ty Alper on November 6 based on his experience, generally progressive outlook and decision-making, and an awareness of equity and racial performance discrepancies within the District. He has exhibited a commitment to the students, the families, and the staff of the District in his tenure on the Board and his re-election is merited. Ka’Dijah Brown is an elementary school teacher in a neighborhood school. She has taught through our Berkeley public schools, Washington, Longfellow, and Berkeley High. She has support throughout the community, including sitting School Board members. Her experience as a teacher-of-color merits support from Berkeley voters; please include Ka’Dijah Brown as one of the three candidates you vote for.

Dru Howard has worked as a classified staff member in BUSD for over 10 years. She has experience on City Commissions and as a parent advocate at Berkeley Head Start, and has had two enrolled children in our public schools. She would bring a unique perspective to the School Board, that of a long-time classified staff member and an employee-of-color. Most Board members come out of teachers’ unions or public administration backgrounds, but someone with Howard’s experience would add another level of diversity to the Board. She deserves our vote; vote for Dru Howard on November 6.

The final three candidates have varied experience and backgrounds. Abdir Sakid lists himself as an Entrepreneur and Professor. He is of Bangladeshi background and would definitely add diversity to the School Board. However, his candidacy does not appear to have much traction or commitment. John Selawsky is an appointed member of the School Board and lost her seat in the last election. She has connections to many politicians, and that’s our major reservation and concern about her. She was very closely allied and associated with the Hancock/Bates machine for many years, and we doubt her independence and objectivity. Norm Harrison has run before and is a Berkley activism well known to many progressives. However, again, her candidacy seems more symbolic than practical, there does not appear to be any traction or commitment to her campaign.

Berkeley Rent Board
James Chang, Soli Alpert, Paola Laverde, Maria Poblet, and John Selawsky VOTE FOR ALL 5!

This one is easy. Five candidates were chosen at Berkeley’s Tenant Convention in April who are committed to protecting and expanding rent-control and eviction protections, and there are three candidates running against them for five seats, two of which are Berkeley Property Owners Association supported and funded, and the other an unknown who doesn’t seem to have any support or campaign effort. John Selawsky, Paola Laverde, Maria Poblet, James Chang, and Soli Alpert are the five tenant endorsed candidates and support to vote for on November 6. Selawsky is current Chair, Laverde is Vice-Chair, Chang and Poblet are incumbent, and Alpert is the newcomer. All have experience with tenant issues and advocacy and each will add a somewhat different set of experiences and perspectives to the Rent Board. All five support Proposition 10, which would end Costa Hawkins and allow locals to fully control their own rent stabilization and eviction policies. James Chang, Soli Alpert, Paola Laverde, Maria Poblet, and John Selawsky deserve your support on November 6. Vote for all five.

Measure O – YES Affordable Housing Bond

This measure authorizes the City to issue $135 million in general obligation bonds to construct, rehabilitate and preserve affordable housing of all types, and creates an independent citizens’ oversight committee to ensure that the funds are spent as intended. Measure O is designed to give the City maximum flexibility to pursue affordable housing projects of all types, and to partner with non-profits and community organizations. The money can be used to leverage state and federal funds that require a local match. Approximately $7.5 million will be generated per year, with an increase in property taxes of about $23 per $100,000 in assessed home value. The City typically uses bonds to finance building projects rather than parcel taxes. Bonds also have the potential to generate a lot of money quickly, and in this case can be used to reimburse the City’s general fund if opportunities arise before the bond money is available. The measure will provide the City real money to fight the “market” forces that have made our community unaffordable for so many who deserve to live here. Vote YES on Measure O.

Measure P – YES Homeless Services Tax

Property Tax Transfer Tax Increase – This measure will generate badly needed revenue to continue Berkeley’s efforts to seriously address the humanitarian crisis on our streets. Measure P increases the tax that is collected by the City when property is sold (the transfer tax) from 1.5 percent to 2.5 percent for commercial and residential properties that sell for over $1.5 million for the next ten years. The money will go into the general fund, and a “Homeless Services Panel of Experts” will be established to make recommen- dations to the City Council on how best to spend the new money to end or prevent homelessness. This is similar to the mechanism established with the Soda Tax to assure account- ability. The City Council’s intent in crafting this measure was to limit the tax increase to only the top one-third of sales, with $1.5 million as a bottom threshold that can be adjusted upward annually. This is a progressive tax that is paid only once, capturing a little bit of the wealth created in increased property values for community services. Vote YES on Measure P.

Measure Q – YES Rent Stabilization and Good Cause for Eviction Ordinance Amendments

If Proposition 10 on the statewide ballot passes, Measure Q ensures that Berkeley will be ready to take back full and fair control of our rental housing market. The 1995 Costa-Hawkins Act was the culmination of a decades-long battle between cities and the rental housing industry that took significant powers away from local governments to fully control rent control and eviction protections. Measure Q would amend the existing ordinance (which exempts “new construction”) to define it as anything built in the last 20 years rather than anything built before 1995. This would extend rent controls to thousands of additional tenants. Newer buildings will automatically come under rent control when they hit the 20-year threshold. The 20-year exemption is generous, but it will ensure that rent control is not viewed as an impediment to new housing construction and that Berkeley’s proposal cannot be used to attack Proposition 10. The measure also amends the ordinance to establish base rent ceilings (the maximum allowable rent) for all covered housing units as the most recent rent. Landlords will be allowed to keep all of the grossly unfair “market” increases since 1995 (no rent rollbacks), but they will no longer be able to raise the rent beyond the rent ceiling when a unit becomes vacant (no more vacancy decontrol!). Hopefully this will prevent legal challenges to the re-imposition of vacancy control. Additionally, new housing units that qualify as “Accessory Dwelling Units” would be exempt. This was included to accommodate homeowners who may want to build an accessory unit or add-on unit that they will have control of its tenancy. While not ideal from a tenant perspective, this will probably affect only a handful of people each year. Since the Rent Ordinance was enacted by a citizen initiative, it can only be changed by a vote of the people. These modest but vital changes need to be enacted now to take advantage of possible changes in state law as soon as possible. Vote YES on Proposition 10, and make it effective November 7 by voting YES on Q!

Measure R – YES Vision 2050 Plan

Measure R is an advisory measure asking the people of Berkeley to get behind the development of “Vision 2050,” a sustainable 30-year plan designed to replace our crumbling infrastructure in the face of radical climate change, employing the latest technologies. Vision 2050 is intended to build on Measure G, an advisory measure that was passed overwhelmingly in 2006 to reduce Berkeley’s greenhouse gas emissions by 80 percent by 2050, and that resulted in the Climate Action Plan. Vision 2050 seems to be the obvi- ous step, not the controversial one. Tell your local legislators that you support this step forward.

Read the CANDIDATES’ QUESTIONNAIRES Online

Most of the candidates returned our questionnaires, for most of the local races. You’ll find lots of additional info in the candidates’ completed questionnaires, so we strongly encourage you to read them on our website: http://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires/. (Or, you can simply go to: http://acgreens.org, and then click on the “Candidate Questionnaires” tab near the top of the page).
Emeryville City Council
Scott Donahue, with reservations
Dianne Martinez, with reservations

Candidates for Emeryville City Council are two incumbents, Scott Donahue and Dianne Martinez, who are running as a slate, and Ken Bukowski, council member of 24 years who has not served on the council the past few cycles. All three expressed satisfaction with the present city charter, general elections, and endorsements will also be posted to our website by mid August. However, we have posted the questionnaires we received back, checked campaign websites, and attended the in-person candidate forum where six candidates were interviewed. Researchers want to acknowledge that several qualified candidates were interviewed. Researchers want to acknowledge that several qualified

Hayward City Council
Aisha Wahab and Sara Lamin

Two seats are open and seven candidates are running. Green Party Researchers went through all the questionnaires received back, checked campaign websites, and attended an in-person candidate forum where six candidates were present (Wahab, Fields, Lamnin, Bukowski, D. Ramos, and J. Ramos—the last two have no relation). The part of the forum that contained the City Council discussion is hardly long and is available online at https://youtu.be/RiEv9k-3GCE. (Other portions of the forum, for Mayor and Hayward Unified School District, are not included in this video). Green Party researchers are concerned that Aisha Wahab and Sara Lamin are vying for the two open seats. Both candidates demonstrated strong progressive commitments in their responses on green issues.

Aisha Wahab is a bright, articulate, ambitious businesswoman and non-profit director; she is energetic and charismatic, with a strong following among younger voters — she received by a good measure the loudest cheers at the Candidates Forum. She is environmentally progressive and drives an electric vehicle. She has spoken at the Women’s March, does not take corporate money for her campaign, has come from being a foster child to being a community leader, and was highlighted in San Francisco Magazine’s “TheResistance!” Issue in 2017. She feels very positive about giving her highest endorsement in this race.

Sara Lamnin is an incumbent and former member of Planning Commission. She fears deficits and wants to control the city’s CALPERS contributions for its employees. She is strongly progressive in her commitment both to affordable housing and to homeless and disadvantaged communities. While on the council she has worked on economic development, public financial management, and public safety. She currently serves in several significant statewide policy committees and also serves as Hayward’s delegate to the County’s Stop/Waste and AC Transit Policy Advisory Committee.

Another incumbent, Marlen Peixoto, has much experience on the Council; he has also demonstrated green commitments, but seems more focused on the housing issue than on expanding open space or access to EV chargers in the city, or how he would expand solar on rooftops. He also struck researchers as more of an old-time kind of Democrat: confident and well intentioned. His accomplishments have been impressive, but he is not the emerging star that researchers were looking for.

Joe Ramos would not seem qualified, since his blunt, loud manner at the candidate forum was a turn-off to those present. We have enough of this kind of grandstanding at the national level, and don’t need more in our local politics.

Mekia Fields has some excellent credentials, including her work for Habitat for Humanity, but seems too inexperienced. Similarly with Didacus Ramos, a city planner with the City Core, a controversial curriculum. Her website is dysfunctional.

William L. (Tyler) McGee in an incumbent and current President of the Board. A middle school principal who strongly supports Visual and Performing Arts, he seems confident and well intentioned. His accomplishments have impressed researchers, including student achievement and maintaining a balanced budget.

Ken Rawdon was middle and high school music teacher in Hayward for 28 years and now is retired. He seems fair, sincere, confident and dedicated to the work. He is endorsed by East Bay Realty Association, so would likely be more conservative on housing issues.

Lisa Brunner is an incumbent with eight years on the Board. At the Candidates Forum, she touted to deliver PR for schools as they are and implicitly endorsed the Common Core, a controversial curriculum. Her website is dysfunctional.

Nicholas Harvey, a scientist/entrepreneur/consultant and avid bicyclist, was not present at the Candidates Forum, and did not return a questionnaire either.

Hayward City Offices and Measures

Personable, energetic, and well intentioned, the mayor can be tough. She knows the city well and is very well liked in Hayward. She reaches across difference and is mostly progressive. Elected to the office in June of 2014, Mayor Halliday serves a four year term for 10 years prior to that. Endorsed by a large number of people in and out of office, she is far and away the better candidate.

Mark Salinas holds a BA from UC Davis, and an M.A. in Educational Administration and Public Policy Studies, both from San Francisco State University. He served on Hayward City Council, 2010-2014, 2016–present. This is his second run for Mayor.

Hayward City Office and Measures

Mayor
Barbara Halliday

Suggesting, including additional bus only lanes on some arterials, preserving parks and open space, and making bike and pedestrian paths more accessible. Scott and Dianne deserve credit for being on a council that has created a fair work week and minimum wage for workers, and got voters to pass Measure C, which will help the homeless, renters and home buyers. Scott states that he registered Green during his council tenure, and has now re-registered Democrat. He and Dianne are both endorsed by the entire present City Council. Of concern to us, both Scott and Dianne have endorsed the corporate Democrat, Buffy Wicks, for State Assembly. The Green Party must certainly has not! As Ken has had difficulties in the past, and is neither seeking endorsements nor funding for his campaign, we’ve decided to endorse the two incumbents, with reservations.

Emery School Board

There are three available seats for Emery Unified School District Governing Board and five candidates: Brynnda Collins, appointed incumbent and present president of the board, Ken Bukowski, who is also running for City Council (please see the Emeryville City Council article), Katy Brown, who did not provide any contact information, so we were not able to interview her, Sarah Goldberg, former Vice President and present Secretary of the Emeryville Parent Teacher Organization, and Sarah Nguyen, a teacher.

At the time the Vote Guide was went to print, we did not have sufficient information to make endorsements. However, we have posted the questionnaires we received on our website (http://aguereens.org/). Further information and endorsements will also be posted to our website by early October.

Measure S - No Endorsement
Emeryville Cannabis Tax

Prior to the passage of Proposition 64, which legalized recreational marijuana use in California, Emeryville had an entrenched illegal market in recreational marijuana sales. One challenge resulting from legalization has been that the state, counties or cities tax marijuana cultivation, business and sales retail sales. The city must continue to flourish. Some state legislators tried to reduce use of the illegal market via a bill (AB 3157) which would have lowered state taxes on marijuana sales from 15 percent to 11 percent, but the bill failed to pass.

In the meantime, many cities in California have implemented city taxes on marijuana sales, and the taxes have varied widely, from 2.5 percent in Albany to 15 percent in Hayward, with most cities taxing at 4-8 percent. Some cities have taxed medical and recreational sales differently, others have not. Emeryville has put on the ballot a measure taxing all gross sales receipts from marijuana businesses at 15 percent. This is a reasonable measure caps the rate, but gives the City Council power to reduce the rate. Measure S misleadingly states the purposes for which the income to the city will be used. As this is a general tax, the money goes into the city’s general fund, and can be used for any purpose the city wishes. The city estimates a $2,000,000 yearly income from the tax. This estimate appears to be based on income from neighboring communities during the first month or quarter of legalization. Oakland made $2.86 million in the first month, Berkeley three times the revenue in the first month than the first month of 2017 when it made $7.1 million. We caution that what works in another city may not work here, and is neither seeking endorsements nor funding for his

Measure H - Yes
Hayward Bond Reservations

Measure Statement: To provide safe/modern schools; upgrade aging classrooms/school facilities; upgrade classroom technology; provide art/music classrooms, improve accessibility for students with disabilities; install solar panels; replace leaky roofs, etc. Shall Hayward Unified School District issue $381,700,000 in bonds and levy approximately $60 per $100,000 of assessed valuation annually to generate approximately $24,502,000 anticipated through 2020 with independent oversight and all funds staying local? For safe/modern schools; upgrade aging classrooms/school facilities; upgrade classroom technology; provide art/music classrooms; improve accessibility for students with disabilities; install solar panels; replace leaky roofs, etc. Shall Hayward Unified School District issue $381,700,000 in bonds and levy approximately $60 per $100,000 of assessed valuation annually to generate approximately $24,502,000 anticipated through 2020 with independent oversight and all funds staying local?

continued on next page
Oakland Mayor
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can view their respective answers online at: http://acgreens. wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires. For choice num-
er 3, we were quite excited to support Saied Karamooz who is
the official nominee of the Green Party of Alameda County
and the Oakland Greens. He has also been endorsed by
Block by Block Organizing Network (BBBON) [#2].

For #2, we have been following the career of Maxson, who is widely known for her
designing business operations to achieve process

City of Oakland

Oakland is holding elections for Mayor, Auditor, three
seats on City Council, and three seats on the Oakland
School Board, all ranked-choice-voting.

One of the main issues at City Hall during the past two
years has been the sudden and unexpected huge increase
in the city budget, besides the long term decrease in

The real culprit in Oakland politics, if the truth were
told, is the city’s youth and his focus on police accountability
issues. Oakland Mayor

continued from page 10

Recognizing that this measure does not address the
problem of low teacher salaries, it does address long-delayed
results with this approach than with the current unacceptable

City Council, District 4

#1: Sheng Thao

#3: Nayell Maxson*, with reservations

(Ranked, but not endorsed) Don’t vote for Michelson

The City Council races come in two types this year.

One is a gerrymandered seat that the incumbent, Annie Campbell Washington, has released
ownership of “her” seat in District 4. This we have a flurry of
would-be professional politicians trying out for their “starter”
job as an elected official who cannot without upsetting
higher-ranking politicians. Mayor Libby Schaaf has given
a first choice endorsement to Charlie Michelson, the CEO
of Oakland’s West Coast Ship Supply who was born and
raised in the district. Considering Michelson’s history,
supports the raid, and then covered for her police chief
who, while a single mother and domestic violence survivor,
put herself through UC-Berkeley; Harris as an Ivy League
educated and Fulbright alumna who eschewed working
on Wall Street to work with people with physical and
devmental disabilities; and Maxson, as the director who
developed and taught Wall Street to work with people with
devmental disabilities; and Maxson, as the director who
turned a financial professional firm into a non-profit
organization that need attention in Oakland city government that have more to do with
good governance, effective planning, and proper commu-

ting and often vindictive and self-serving, politicians at City
Hall. Schaaf is the best person to empower the police commission created in

City Hall is in police accountability. Despite being well into our
second decade of federal court oversight and second year of a
police commission, the foot dragging continues. When it
came time to empower the police commission created in
2016, Mayor Libby Schaaf and her supporters have looked for
ways to undercut the authority and independence of our
limited police accountability mechanism.

There are many candidates running in the mayor’s seat who
are knowledgeable in the job of auditing and that need attention in Oakland city
government that have more to do with
good governance, effective planning, and proper commu-

can view their respective answers online at: http://acgreens. word...
While we are forced to make these cuts, the so called charter school movement has siphoned off vast amounts of funds, enrollment and real estate for projects that they call public schools but which are operated more like private ones. These charter schools have been taking “their share” of the funds, but do not contribute to the commons of an urban school district when they do not want to. Their “movement” is still heavily funded by billionaire school “reformers” who spent heavily in our last election.

The cash spent on our elections seems to have come from Bloomberg, the Rogers Family Foundation, and from groups affiliated with the billionaire public school meddling summiteers. There is no evidence that there have been a full accountability of what was spent in Oakland in 2016, but it is near a million dollars on four school board races and represents interfer- ence and corruption in our democracy by big money.

Three of the four school board members are, or were charter-movement supported, one first got elected with its support and all seven have been part of the serial funding fiascos and authorizations of more charters, or at least in non-opposition most of the time. In no way has this board shown leadership on these major issues. They blame their problems on Proposition 13 and state law, but they do not lead any effort to change such laws or advocate for Oakland’s special needs.

Because the board majority is in favor of the charter school policy, there is virtually no resistance to the destruct- ive effects of Proposition 13, which, as we know, is near impossible to deny a charter or control its use of taxpayer funds. Our school board has now resolved that the public schools and the charters are a single cooperative community. As a result, these and other policies that the Inner Party will not support any current incumbent school board member, or any candidate supported by “charter movement” funding. We will only endorse or recommend school board candidates who have a commitment to our children, education, our teachers and their union and to our community in general, and who are independent of the money and political interests that have been creating the battleground in our public-school systems.

This year we have two incumbents who do not deserve another term but are running unopposed, which is a crime, and one seat challenged because the incumbent in District Four dropped out.

School Board, District 2

Don’t vote for Eng

School Board, District 6

Don’t vote for Gonzales

This is the saddest school board election in years. Note that we are doing the possible to get real political leadership. None really stands out, but there are a couple who would make good council members. There is not a lot of difference between the candidates. We recommend Natasha Middleton, Loren T. Mya, and Taylor. Mya Whitaker. Note that Taylor has Mayor Schaeffer’s first endorsement and Middleton used to be on her staff. At this point, however, most would be prefer- able to the incumbent.

Oakland Charter School

What matters most in Oakland schools is the well-being of our children while they are in school and after they leave, hopefully with a high school diploma. Measured in this way, Oakland schools are a mixed bag. Overall schools are doing better to provide a safe environment, and so is Oakland as the national high crime madness has subsided here as elsewhere. By certain measures the gradu- ation rate is up. Truancy rates may be lower. Life in the classroom provides many developmental opportunities for all of our children, mostly thanks to the hard-working staff, teachers and community volunteers.

But Oakland’s schools are in a disastrous crisis of dis- cipline and mismanagement of their own making. In calendar year 2017 the OUSD board gave us four budget cuts, each one too small for any real improvement and, as usual, took away funds from the classroom programs. Trans- parency and accountability is an ongoing disappointment. We also lost our superintendent to another school district where he was asked to resign in disgrace. Three of those budget cuts involved state funds and caused immediate cutting of programs, loss of funding and instability in the classrooms. The school board “trustees” are currently debating yet another set of cuts that includes sport programs and we fear another round of layoffs. The teachers’ union is being pressured to cooperate with these austerity measures.

Measure W - YES

Homeless Services Vacant Property Tax

Measure W on the Oakland November ballot creates a new city tax on vacant parcels of property. According to W, parcels are deemed vacant if they are used less than 50 days per year. The new tax rates are $6,000 annually for residential, nonresidential and unemployed properties, $3,000 annually for vacant condominiums, townhouses, duplexes and floor ground commercial space parcels.

The measure provides a number of exemptions from these taxes. They include very low income households, low income seniors and people with disabilities who can demon- strate that the tax would be a financial or other hardship. Also exempted are properties already being developed and non-profit owners.

Measure W funds can only be used for purposes de- scribed in W. Those include programs and services for the homeless, financial assistance for development or maintenance of affordable housing. The city is required use at least 25 percent of money raised for code enforcement and to eliminate blight and remedial illegal dumping. With some limits money could be used for administering the measure.

The measure would create a new Commission on Homelessness to develop and make recommendations for spending this money and publish an annual report on implementation and expenditures of the tax money. The City Auditor would regularly audit revenue and expenditures. The tax would be levied no sooner than the 2020-21 fiscal year and would expire 20 years thereafter. A 2/3 Yes vote is required to pass the measure.

The League of Women Voters estimates around 5,000 properties could be affected if Measure W passes. The League also estimates that up to $100,000,000 a year would be raised.

Measure W is a very limited measure. $10,000,000 is a drop in the bucket considering the size of the problems and that amount is less than 1 percent of the annual city budget. 50 days is too little time to consider a property is being used. The large number of exemptions is a problem also. Even though this measure is weak, it does have op- position, being coordinated by Larry Tramutola, a mainstream political operative for status quo politics.

On the positive note Measure W does highlight the situa- tion of the homeless in our city. It is an indictment of the landlords and real estate speculators who run our city. Even if it is a weak measure, the property tax could do more than the “market” to meet human needs.

Vote Yes on Measure W.

Measure X - Yes, with reservations

Graduated Real Estate Transfer Tax

Currently the sale of real property in Oakland is taxed at the rate of $1.10 per $1,000 by Alameda County and $15.00 per $1,000 by the City. Under state law the taxes collected by a county are split with the city in which the sale occurs. Charter cities in Alameda County charge between $4.50 per $1,000 and $10.00 per $1,000. In Oakland and Berkeley, the highest in the State. General Law cities including Livermore, Pleasanton, and Dublin, along with many charter cities in the State do not tax real estate transfers. The value of Oakland City’s real estate, including many charter cities, do not impose this tax, instead relying on receiving one-half of the $1.10 per $1,000 tax imposed.

The tiers proposed by the measure are unlikely to re- duce the tax burden on first time low income home buyers because the 1 percent tier is limited to properties selling for less than $300,000, an amount below what is considered average in Oakland sell. It is not clear that anyone will see any sig- nificant reduction in their property tax transfer bill while the biggest change this law makes is the increase in tax on sales above $5,000. A $5,000,000 level in the state currently imposing a tiered tax rate structure, but the rates on properties selling for less than $5 million is $7.50 per $1,000, far less than the current Oakland tax.

The proposed measure is a good step towards reducing the tax burden on home buyers and renters. Oakland is a city of low income families and renters and property taxes should not be a high tax on medical cannabis, which definitely shouldn’t be taxed at such a high rate. Vote “Yes” on Measure V.

City Council, District 2

Sharing #1 & #2: Nikki Fortunato Bas* and Kenzie (Donte) Smith*

(*Ranked, but not endorsed)

Don’t vote for Guillon

Abel Guillon has a challenger from the non-profit “left- ist” Democrats. Nikki Fortunato Bas, along with a message candidate, Kenzie (Donte) Smith, who was guilty of using a BBQ while black. Inspired by the Black Panther Party, Kenzie has learned to make shoes with her hands and is a member of the community. She is well respected by his constituents. Smith’s website states he will not accept contributions from “big name companies.” Both Bas and Smith are better choices than the incumbent. Guillon’s voting record is consistently on the wrong side of real estate and affordable housing issues when he is not voting the police officer’s union line to undermine the police commission. The status quo will not do. Nikki Bas is qualified as an effective council member, but she will only be better than Guillon on certain issues. Our reservation about Smith is that she has less experience than Bas.

City Council, District 6

Sharing #1 and #2: Marlo Rodriguez* and Mya Whitaker*

(*Ranked, but not endorsed)

Don’t vote for Brooks, Middleton, or Taylor

Desley Brooks also shows no leadership of the progres- sive community and is not helping develop new leadership. Brooks has done over the years to get resources to African American organizations and ignore her sharp elbows while doing it, there is stronger reason to question her personal behavior and her part in forcing her into and the unethical around her relationships to city funding. She has been the subject of an Alameda County Grand Jury report and there are at least two lawsuits against her, one of which is about her famous physical attack on an elder. Desley Brooks also shows no leadership of the progres- sive community and is not helping develop new leadership among the youth of our district. The challengers are a mix with many doing better to provide a safe environment, and who are more grass roots -- all of them Democrats. There exists an “anyone but Desley” group with some serious funding.

Nikki Fortunato Bas is qualified to be an effective City Council, District 6

Sharing #1 & #2: Marlo Rodriguez* and Mya Whitaker*

(*Ranked, but not endorsed)

Don’t vote for Brooks, Middleton, or Taylor

Desley Brooks also has a challenger from a candidate closer to Mayor Schaeffer and from three other candidates who are more grass roots -- all of them Democrats. There exists an “anyone but Desley” group with some serious funding. While there is strong reason to admire much of what Ms. Brooks has done, including push for much needed school choice and mismanagement of their own making. In calendar year 2017 the OUSD board gave us four budget cuts, each one too small for any real improvement and, as usual, took away funds from the classroom programs. Transparency and accountability is an ongoing disappointment. We also lost our superintendent to another school district where he was asked to resign in disgrace. Three of those budget cuts involved state funds and caused immediate cutting of programs, loss of funding and instability in the classrooms. The school board “trustees” are currently debating another set of cuts that includes sport programs and we fear another round of layoffs. The teachers’ union is being pressured to cooperate with these austerity measures.
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The ballot arguments do not provide the context needed to determine what the overall impact will be on property sales and whether the measure will provide the relief to lower property taxes. The two arguments presented have logical flaws. What the measure will do is increase the tax on properties selling for over $2 million, which will provide the projected increase in revenue to the City. The tiered rates are a stop in the right direction but because it’s questionable whether very many low or moderate income residents will actually benefit from Measure X, we’re endorsement it “with reservations.”

**Measure Y - YES Just Cause Eviction Amendments**

Measure Y would make it harder for homeowners who live in duplexes and triplexes to evict tenants living on the property. A new landlord would still be able to select one of the units to live in, but the remaining tenants would be protected by “closing” the present just cause eviction loophole. This loophole has allowed property owners to push longtime tenants out and rent to newer wealthier tenants for a much higher rent. Just Cause protections currently do not prevent landlord owners from evicting renters so that they or a qualified relative can then reside on their property. Without Just Cause protections, discriminatory and retaliatory evictions are difficult to prove and tenants simply move, which thereby increases displacement and homelessness. The Association of Realtors (AOR) claim it would cost “thousands of dollars” in attorney fees if a problem arises, but we believe they’re merely fearmongering and disregarding democracy and fairness.

Vote YES on Measure Y.

**Measure Z - YES Hotel Workers Workplace Protections and Wages**

It would seem a “No Brainer” to support this Oakland initiative, focusing on wages and work conditions of hotel workers but other important features as well.

This amending of the Oakland municipal code has four basic features. The first two are linked together and specific to hotel workers: first, it would improve wages to $15 an hour (with benefits) or $20 an hour (without benefits); second, it would significantly improve working conditions, including devices/means to report harassment of workers, limiting mandatory overtime, and having access to employer pay and hours records.

The other features include, but go beyond hotel workers, and focus on enforcement. First, the burden of follow through on the municipal labor code would place much more responsibility on the city, including bringing legal civil action against employers. Perhaps even more impactful would be the establishment, by July, 2020, of a Department of Workplace and Employment Standards, at a projected cost of $2.8 million annually. These enforcement features are quite important since often labor and other laws are passed without means or resources to back them up.

This measure was placed on the ballot through petition. While it is limited to hotels with 50 or more rooms/suites, it would be a great step forward for Oakland workers and be complimentary to the HERE-UNITE 2850 contract campaign at the Marriott. As a final point, it’s worth noting that the negative argument in the County’s voter guide was authored by the notorious pro corporate and regressive city councilman Larry Reid.

**Measure AA - NO, NO! Education Parcel Tax Charter Amendment “Children’s Initiative of 2018”**

We are opposed to The Children’s Initiative of 2018. We don’t believe that we should increase taxes on housing while we are in the midst of a housing affordability crisis, especially to create a fund that will be under the Mayor’s control, with no plan on how this money will actually improve early childhood education in Oakland.

This tax is a regressive tax. Every parcel of land in Oakland will be assessed a tax, commercial parcels based on their size, single residence units $398, and multi-unit residences $335 per unit. This proposed tax will last for 30 years! Although this tax will only be levied on property owners, we know that most landlords will pass this cost on to their renters. Any tax that adds to Oakland’s skyrocketing housing costs is ill-advised at this time. Oakland already has two early childhood education systems. We have a federally-funded city-run head start program and we have Early Children Education Centers of Oakland (ECEC) which run programs run by OUSD. This initiative does not go directly to fund either of the existing programs, instead 62 percent will be used to create a Children’s Initiative Fund and 33 percent to create an Oakland Promise Fund.

It is hard to determine how this money would be used. The initiative has no language on who will manage the Oakland Promise Fund, but we can assume it will be managed by Oakland Promise, Oakland Promise is run by the Oakland Public Education Fund, which like GO (GO Oakland Public Schools) was started and is heavily funded by the Rogers Foundation, pro-charter school advocates. There is no community control or oversight over Oakland Promise, which, as a private non-profit is not even required to report to the community. Oakland Promise supports and promotes charter schools and privatization. Currently most of its funding comes from philanthropy. It is not proper to fund Oakland Promise directly with tax dollars.

The Children’s Initiative Fund will be managed by a committee appointed by the Mayor for 3-year terms. Committee members are not required to be Oakland residents. This mayoral committee will have the sole authority over how this fund will be used. If passed this parcel tax will raise millions of dollars a year and instead of it going directly to OUSD or Oakland Head Start it will be controlled by people and organizations politically connected to the Mayor.

We urge everyone to vote no on Mayor Schaaf’s Children’s Initiative of 2018. We cannot afford a regressive tax that will increase housing costs in order to fund the Mayor’s pet project that continues to fund the privatization of public education with no community oversight.

RCV allows you to “rank” three candidates, rather than being forced to choose just one. Instant Runoff Voting (IRV) is more descriptive: when a candidate is eliminated, it’s as if there is a run-off between the remaining candidates.

During the first round of IRV, only the votes ranked first are counted. If nobody has a majority of votes, an elimination process begins. The candidate with the fewest votes is eliminated. If it’s your candidate, your next choice, if any, transfers up. This continues until someone has a majority. Your highest remaining candidate remains YOUR ONLY VOTE until that candidate is eliminated, or wins. Your other choices DO NOT MATTER and are not counted unless your higher ranked choices are eliminated. If you choose to vote for only one or two candidates, if they are eliminated, then your ballot is “exhausted.” It’s as if you chose not to vote in the remaining run-offs.

IRV is great because you can rank “sincere choices” — candidates you actually like — without “throwing away” your vote.

IRV invites strategies like:

• Only ranking sincere choices, people with politics or ideals you believe in, even if they can’t win.
• Saving the last vote for the “least disliked front-runner” in case your sincere choices are eliminated. Use your last place vote strategically. It may be the only one that counts.

• Make a statement by ranking a candidate you want to appear in the vote counting until they are eliminated, even if they’re not a sincere choice, as long as they have no chance of winning.

Regardless of your strategy, NEVER rank a front-runner you don’t want to see elected. Your vote could put them over the top.

The Oakland Greens 2019 FREE Dinner and a Movie discussion series

The “Last Sundays” of every month at It’s Your Move Games & Hobbies 4920 Telegraph Ave, in the historic Temescal district.

Free Dinner starts @6:30 P.M.
Movie and discussion begins @7:30 p.m.

The Oakland Greens Dinner and a Movie discussion series is a community building event held in a relaxed fun space and organized by Green Party members to discuss solutions to local issues that hurt us and many others. Dinner has all options for omnivores, herbivores, and vegans.

RSVP by email dvpx64@gmail.com or Facebook www.facebook.com/oaclandgreens
New Haven School Board
Sarbjit Cheema

There are two open seats on a board of five, with four candidates running for those seats. Sarbjit Cheema, returning her questionnaire to us, two of the others explicitly said they were not seeking a Green Party endorsement, and one of those said she would ask the last candidate to contact us if she still was not hearing from us.

The one candidate who did respond to us, Cheema, had very strong answers, and is currently the Board Presi-
dent. Sarbjit Cheema has been on the board for six years and has been very active in meeting various goals, but little substance on how to do the above. As an avid bicyclist and frequent bus-rider with in AC Transit, Ward 4

Dollene Jones

If the standard is to elect someone who will do no harm, then that would be anyone but Joel B. Young, the incumbent. He did not return the Green Party questionnaire, but his past questionable actions speak for themselves. He seems to be the most concerned about what the board can do for him and not what he can do for AC Transit. He has used informa-
tion only the board and legal staff are privy to for a law firm he works for. We have sent him a copy of this. Also, he reportedly struck his ex-girlfriend in the face after she caught him cheating. A year after that Young spit in the eye of fellow politician Jason Overman, then campaign manager for Rebecca Kaplan’s mayoral campaign.

Young did not seem to have paid attention to the stuff reports on the fuel cell buses or AC Transit’s finances, because his single campaign statement is “I believe that AC Transit can support an entire fleet of these buses...” If the agency did so, it would have to severely cut back the existing. The incumbent, Mark Williams, was elected to the AC Transit Board in 2010, and it has been nearly as long since his campaign has filed any campaign statements as required by state law. Williams had no campaign funds in 2010. With no subsequent filings, the public remains in the dark about how that money was spent, who funded his campaign, and how much. Williams filed election documents before the 2014 election to change the name of his committee for his re-election campaign. He then went on to win the race in 2014 without filing a single campaign statement, effectively hiding his campaign activities from his opponent and the public.

His run for the seat in 2018 is shaping up to be no dif-
ferent, although he appears to have negotiated the $60,000 line down to $7,135.

The challenger, entrepreneur Nicholas Harvey, is much better at tiling paperwork. Harvey filed papers and will appear on the ballot for five local races; however, the AC Transit Board seat is the one he is most enthusiastic to win. Harvey was inspired to run because, in his words, upon observing California’s Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC).

Earlier this year as he faced $60,000 in penalties imposed by AC Transit Board in 2010, and it has been nearly as long since his campaign has filed any campaign statements as required by state law. Williams had no campaign funds in 2010. With no subsequent filings, the public remains in the dark about how that money was spent, who funded his campaign, and how much. Williams filed election documents before the 2014 election to change the name of his committee for his re-election campaign. He then went on to win the race in 2014 without filing a single campaign statement, effectively hiding his campaign activities from his opponent and the public.
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Earlier this year as he faced $60,000 in penalties imposed by AC Transit Board in 2010, and it has been nearly as long since his campaign has filed any campaign statements as required by state law. Williams had no campaign funds in 2010. With no subsequent filings, the public remains in the dark about how that money was spent, who funded his campaign, and how much. Williams filed election documents before the 2014 election to change the name of his committee for his re-election campaign. He then went on to win the race in 2014 without filing a single campaign statement, effectively hiding his campaign activities from his opponent and the public.
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The challenger, entrepreneur Nicholas Harvey, is much better at tiling paperwork. Harvey filed papers and will appear on the ballot for five local races; however, the AC Transit Board seat is the one he is most enthusiastic to win. Harvey was inspired to run because, in his words, upon observing California’s Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC).
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His run for the seat in 2018 is shaping up to be no dif-
ferent, although he appears to have negotiated the $60,000 line down to $7,135.
Since the 2013 BART labor contract negotiations were so terribly handled and had such an effect on the Bay Area, BART and its leadership have received more attention. A Board sanctioned study of the BART board in progress to review the 2013 negotiations, as the former head of the East Bay Bicycle Coalition, and has tended to vote with the more progressive side of the BART Board of Directors, but has not been a strong proponent of change, pledging to fix problems at BART in an acceptable manner. Raburn’s answer to our question on this topic was the type of answer a politician gives before they vote the way they know they shouldn’t. We’d like to see him articulate a more clear position in support of fair treatment of workers on this and other issues.

The only other candidate, Paul Cummings, told us he would not be returning our questionnaire. His web page does not have much content about him other than brief mention of some environmental issues that were highly covered in the news. His platform for improving safety is to stock more train parts.

For the reasons cited above, we are not able to endorse either candidate in this race.

**BART Board, District 6 No Endorsement**

We were not able to come to a consensus on this race. Some of our volunteers have participated in candidate forums for numerous races and heard the candidates for this race answer numerous questions, in addition to reviewing candidates’ online web pages and other materials. Of the two candidates, Ayn Wieskamp has a long list of elected and professional qualifications. His answers to the questionnaire were vague and general, for example: “I would like the opportunity to preserve open spaces for people to enjoy for the next century.” Ayn has won the endorsement of a long list of elected officials, including the Sierra Club and four of the more progressive and environmentally-conscious BART Board members. For these reasons, we are unable to recommend either candidate in this race.

**EBMUD, Ward 7 No Endorsement**

There are two candidates on the ballot, the incumbent, Frank Mellon, and a challenger, Nicholas Harvey. However, Harvey has decided not to return our BART questionnaire, but he did return our AC Transit questionnaire. Mellon is a long-time incumbent and we endorsed him in 2012 because at that time this position was open on the Board. It seems he hasn’t gotten any better over the past 8 years. Most of his questionnaire answers were quite short and lacked enough specifics to give us any understanding in what he would do to be able to vote for Mellon either. For EBMUD, Ward 7, write in the name of your cat, dog, or goldfish.

**EBRPD, Ward 5 No Endorsement**

This race is a repeat of a four years ago with incumbent Ayn Wieskamp again challenging small business owner Dev Gandhi, who received 24 percent of the vote in 2014.

Ayn Wieskamp, from Livermore, is the current board vice president and candidate for Ward 5, which includes Pleasanton, Sunol, Sunol, Newark, and much of the region north of San Jose. He passes through Concord, Dublin, Livermore, Fremont, and Hayward. We would prefer to have a candidate in the race who is willing to implement them. Vote “No” to send a message to the Green Party candidates that we can do it, so can EBRPD!
Prop 10

continued from page 1

1995. In cities that already have rent control, like Berkeley, it prohibits rent control on all properties constructed after 1995. In cities that do not have rent control, any new rent control ordinances will be preempted. Millions of tenants have been pushed into poverty by high and rising rents while wages remain stagnant. The single leading cause of eviction is rent. Rent control is an inability to pay a rent increase. We are all paying the price for weak or non-existent rent control. Repealing Costa – Hawkins by passing Proposition 10 will give local governments more tools to regulate their housing markets, prevent evictions and combat homelessness. What it will NOT do is institute statewide rent control, roll back rents or any of the other ridiculous claims made by the greedy opposition. The passage of Proposition 10 is only the beginning. If we pass it in November, the battle for affordability will move to every city and county in California. We are enthusiastically YES, YES, YES on Proposition 10.

Proposition 1 - Yes, with reservations
Housing Assistance Bonds

There’s no doubt among Californians that we have a serious housing shortage. Intending to finally do something about it, Prop 1 will allow the state to issue general obligation bonds under two mandates. A $1 billion bond issuance would be used to facilitate housing solutions, prevent evictions and combat homelessness. The other $3 billion authorized issuance would be split with $450 million each going to infrastructure (think roads and transit) and the remaining $2.5 billion split among urban in-fill and transit-oriented development. While the list of projects that could be funded is impressive, there is a very real chance that millions of dollars will be used to build housing for senior citizens that would otherwise be destined for those with a higher income.

Proposition 3 - NO
Water and Wildlife Bonds

What? Another water bond on the November ballot? Didn’t we just pass a water bond (Proposition 68, for $4 billion) in June? And wasn’t there another water bond (Proposition 1, for $7.5 billion in bonds) in 2014? Well, this one is different, and not in a good way. The last few water bonds were passed through the Legislature to reach a consensus of the elected representatives, and then put on the ballot. But Proposition 3 was put on the ballot by people who want certain projects paid for by the taxpayers, by a signature drive paid for by those who will benefit. For that reason, the existing legal and political left orientation of the people of California. Our $8.877 billion bond issue has almost 20 projects that will cost $100,000,000 or more, of which the largest is $1.28 billion, the Friant Water Project. The Friant Water Project is a disaster for water conveyance capital improvements, including restored and increased conveyance capacity to and in the Madera and Friant-Kern canals. According to the Sierra Club, “increased groundwater … has led to subsidence, which has damaged the canals. Those who pumped the water and caused the damage should pay for repair the canals.” The Sierra Club California has taken an opposite position on Proposition 3. Their article is called “Proposition 3: A Fiscally Irresponsible Approach to California’s Water Problems,” and can be found on their website.

Proposition 63 - NO
Transportation Funding, Gas Taxes, Vehicle Fees

This contentious initiative aims to repeal all fuel and vehicle taxes and fees levied under Senate Bill 1 (#SB1, 2017) and change the California Constitution to prohibit gas taxes increases without voter approval. The measure also increases property taxes and requires that the “gas tax” be split with $600 million to combat homelessness, $6 billion for 20,000 units, and the rest goes to local governments. The people who want to repeal SB1 are divided on what should replace the gas tax. Proposition 63 won’t do anything to make housing more affordable. The opponents argue that it won’t have any significant impact on the housing crisis. They claim that it will only fund 20,000 units, even if it delivers as promised. $6 billion for 20,000 units? Yes, it is a lot of money. Would it be cheaper to buy today’s overpriced family homes and give people rooms in them.

The most important thing about the issue this time is that “Prop 63 could end up making more mentally ill people homeless, not less.”

And housing is only a part of what is needed and does not stand in for universal health care. What the people we care about need is an inability to pay a rent increase. We are all paying the price for weak or non-existent rent control. Repealing Costa – Hawkins by passing Proposition 10 will give local governments more tools to regulate their housing markets, prevent evictions and combat homelessness. What it will NOT do is institute statewide rent control, roll back rents or any of the other ridiculous claims made by the greedy opposition. The passage of Proposition 10 is only the beginning. If we pass it in November, the battle for affordability will move to every city and county in California. We are enthusiastically YES, YES, YES on Proposition 10.

Proposition 5 - NO
Property Tax Base Transfers

Proposition 5 pits the real estate industry against local government. Ballotpedia reports that as of July 26th $7.20 million was raised to support Prop. 5. Of that amount 58 percent had been raised from the California Association of Realtors alone ($4.1 million) and 42 percent from the National Association of Realtors.

In 1978 Proposition 13 imposed strict limits on how much residential property could be taxed. In 1986 Proposition 5 was amended Prop. 5, so that homeowners over 55 years old could transfer the value of their home to a new home of lesser or equal value to the home sold. But the new home had to be in the same County as the house sold, and had to be purchased within two years of sale of the old home. In addition, such a transfer of value could only happen once. In 1988 Proposition 90 amended Prop. 13 to allow homeowners over 55 to transfer the taxable value of their home to another county of their new home. At present only 10 counties allow these transfers. Prop. 5 proposes to amend Prop. 13 to allow homeowners over 55, or who are disabled, to transfer the Prop. 13-taxable value of their home: (1) to a more expensive new home, (2) anywhere in the state, (3) any number of times. If passed, the existing legislation would be made absolute. After the passage of Prop. 5 schools and local governments would lose $100 million a year, and in later years the loss would be $1 billion a year. Some lawmakers say that it would allow older people who’ve outgrown their homes to move into smaller homes closer to their families. The supporters argue that Prop. 5 would ease the housing crisis because there will be more houses available when the older folks sell. But Prop. 5 gives an incentive to sell only if the older folks intend to buy a new house. There’s nothing in the proposition to add to the existing number of houses in the state.

The Congress of California Seniors, an umbrella group of senior organizations, opposes Prop. 5. The are joined by the following: AFSCME California, CA Alliance for Retired Americans, California Federation of Labor, California Federation of Professional Firefighters, CA State Association of Counties, CA Teachers Association, League of Women Voters of CA, National Housing Law Project, Middle Class Taxpayers Association, SEIU California. Vote No on Proposition 5.

Proposition 6 - NO
Transportation Funding, Gas Taxes, Vehicle Fees

This contentious initiative aims to repeal all fuel and vehicle taxes and fees levied under Senate Bill 1 (#SB1, 2017) and change the California Constitution to prohibit gas taxes increases without voter approval. Prop 63 won’t do anything to make housing more affordable. The opponents argue that it won’t have any significant impact on the housing crisis. They claim that it will only fund 20,000 units, even if it delivers as promised. $6 billion for 20,000 units? Yes, $6 billion for 20,000 units. What the people we care about need is an inability to pay a rent increase. We are all paying the price for weak or non-existent rent control. Repealing Costa – Hawkins by passing Proposition 10 will give local governments more tools to regulate their housing markets, prevent evictions and combat homelessness. What it will NOT do is institute statewide rent control, roll back rents or any of the other ridiculous claims made by the greedy opposition. The passage of Proposition 10 is only the beginning. If we pass it in November, the battle for affordability will move to every city and county in California. We are enthusiastically YES, YES, YES on Proposition 10.

Proposition 4 - Yes, with reservations
Children’s Hospitals Bonds

Of course we should have hospitals that focus on the needs of children and yes we should all pay for them through higher taxes. What the state needs is a health care system, not a health care market. Given our backwards approach to public wellbeing, funding infrastructure for these non-profits is not bad, but at the end of the day, even the private ones, is probably the best we can do. That is not the fault of the hospitals, it is a consequence of not having single payer, universal health care, nor a real health department that focuses on the needs of senior organizations, opposes Prop. 5. The are joined by the following: AFSCME California, CA Alliance for Retired Americans, California Federation of Labor, California Federation of Professional Firefighters, CA State Association of Counties, CA Teachers Association, League of Women Voters of CA, National Housing Law Project, Middle Class Taxpayers Association, SEIU California. Vote No on Proposition 5.

State Propositions
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It should not be a surprise that Big Pharma spends as little on providing care as it can to maximize profits. Prop 8, also called the Fair Pricing for Dialysis Act, will limit the amount of non-care costs and profits to 15 percent above the actual cost of providing care, versus the 350 percent mark up the industry currently extracts for patients, which is why a YES vote is supported by CalPERS (California Public Employees’ Retirement System) and the Congress of California Seniors.

Prop 8 intends to force the $3 billion California dialysis industry to pay more in benefits, salaries, and employee development for front line workers by limiting the amount of administrative overhead. Prop 8 will ensure these companies are incentivized to improve working conditions, wages and quality of care by limiting “cost of care” calculations to equipment, workforce development and non-managerial staff. All revenues above 115 percent of the actual cost of care will be refunded to the payee, encouraging the companies to invest in their workforce and improve patient care.

Prop 8 is the brainchild of the SEIU-UHW (Service Employees International Union-United Healthcare Workers West) and the initiative campaign is funded entirely by the union. The largest dialysis corporation in California, Davita and Fresenius Medical Care North America, are rabidly anti-union, hence the SEIU taking this fight to the ballot. Like many corporate regulation issues of our time, the opposition is funded exclusively by the affected corporations, in this case, three large dialysis companies who stand to lose profits (the above two and American Renal Associates). Their opposition arguments are disingenuous, ignore key facts (like savings being returned to insurers AND public health programs, not consumers necessarily), and make the tired trope that if they are profit-limited, clinics will close. To add insult to injury, they claim inner city clinics will close, when Prop 8 specifically aims to force clinics to reinvest in their facilities.

We need Medicare for All and we will continue to fight for it until it is a reality. Prop 8 is a good measure because it moves in that direction by protecting consumers from price gouging and will incentivize better pay for workers. Vote YES.

[ Proposal 9, the Three Californias initiative, was removed from the ballot by order of the California Supreme Court.]

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, 5:00-6:30 pm
Where: Niebyl-Proctor Library, 6501 Telegraph Avenue, Oakland (between Alcatraz Ave. and 65th St.)
Wheelchair accessible.

Please Donate to support the Green Voter guide! Use the Page 2 coupon or donate online: https://acgreens.wordpress.com/donate/ Or use this QR code:
SAiED KARAMOOZ
for Oakland Mayor


If you believe that Enduring Public Safety can be achieved only through Quality Education, Dignified Housing, and Secure Jobs, then vote for SAiED as Oakland’s next mayor.

A Trustworthy Candidate with Sensible Solutions

Ideas@EveryOnesMayor.org . 510-986-4477 . EveryOnesMayor.org

Vote Aidan Hill - Rank #1
Berkeley City Council District #7

MORE STUDENT HOUSING NOW

Election Day | November 6th 2018

ONE YEAR:
End Houselessness in D7 via Tiny Houses
End Hunger by Eliminating Food Waste
Support Free Menstrual and Sexual Health Products
**GO PAPERLESS**

The PDF version of this Voter Guide is available on our website at http://acgreens.wordpress.com/voter-guides. Would you like to save some trees and printing/postage costs? PLEASE LET US KNOW at paperless@greenpartyofalameda county.org that you prefer to receive email (with our Green Voter Card plus a link to the full voter Guide online) instead of printed copies.

Printed copies (for your use, and to distribute) will always be available at our Green Party headquarters at 222 Blake Street, Berkeley, CA 94704; (510) 644-2293. Donations of any amount are encouraged (but not required). Thanks everyone!

**State Executive Offices**
- Boycott the Following Races - see front-page article:
  - Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller,
  - Treasurer; Attorney General, and Insurance Commissioner
- Superintendent of Public Instruction - [Don’t vote for Tuck]

**Federal Offices**
- U.S. Senate - Boycott this race, please see write-up
- U.S. Representative, District 13 - Laura Walls

**Other State Offices**
- State Board of Equalization, District 2 - Boycott this race: see front-page article
- State Assembly, District 15 - Jovanka Beckles*
  - This candidate is recommended, but not endorsed
  - (because she is a Democrat)
- State Assembly, District 18 - No Endorsement, please see write-up

**Judicial Offices**
- State Supreme Court - Carol Corrigan, with reservations;
  - and Leondra Kruger, with reservations
- State Courts of Appeal, First District - No Endorsements, please see write-up

**Special School Districts**
- Peralta Community College, Area 3 - Corean Todd
- Peralta Community College, Area 5 - Cindi Napoli-Aabella Reiss

**County Offices**
- Assessor - [Don’t vote for Johnson]

**City Offices**

- Alameda
  - Mayor - Frank Matarrese, with reservations
  - City Council - John Knox White
  - School Board - Gary Lym
  - Healthcare District, Short Term - Dennis Popalardo

- Berkeley
  - Auditor - Jenny Wong
  - City Council, District 1 - #1: Igor Tregub, #2: Mary Behm-Steinberg,
    - #3: Margo Schuler; with reservations - [Don’t vote for Kesarwani]
  - City Council, District 4 - Kate Harrison
  - City Council, District 7 - #1: Aidan Hill, #2: Rigel Robinson,
    - #3: No endorsement, leave blank
  - City Council, District 8 - #1: Mary Kay Lacey, #2: Alfred Twu,
    - with reservations, #3: Russ Tilleman, with reservations - [Don’t vote for Droste]
  - School District Board - Ty Alper, Ka’Dijah Brown, and Dru Howard
  - Rent Stabilization Board - James Chang, Soli Alpert, Paola Laverde,
  - Maria Poblet, John Selawsky - VOTE FOR ALL 5!

- Emeryville
  - City Council - Scott Donahue, with reservations; and Dianne Martinez,
    - with reservations
  - School District Board - No Endorsement, see information on our website

- Hayward
  - Mayor - Barbara Halliday
  - City Council - Aisha Wahab and Sara Lamin [Don’t vote for Joe Ramos]
  - School District Board - Todd E. Davis and April Oquenda

**Oakland**
- Mayor - #1: Saied Karamooz, Sharing #2 & #3: Cat Brooks* and Pamela Price* - [Don’t vote for Schaff]
- Auditor - Courtney Ruby
- City Council, District 2 - Sharing #1 & #2: Nikki Fortunato Bas* and Kenzie Donte Smith* - [Don’t vote for Guillen]
- City Council, District 4 - #1: Sheng Thao, #2: Pamela Harris,
  - #3: Nayeli Maxson*, with reservations - [Don’t vote for Michelon]
- City Council, District 6 - Sharing #1 and #2: Marlo Rodriguez* and
  - Mia Whittaker* - [Don’t vote for Brooks, Middleton, or Taylor]
- School Board, District 2 - [Don’t vote for Eng]
- School Board, District 4 - Clarissa Doudert
- School Board, District 6 - [Don’t vote for Gonzales]
  - *This candidate has been ranked, but not endorsed

**Special Districts**
- A.C. Transit, At-Large - Dolleone Jones
- A.C. Transit, Ward 4 - Nicholas Harvey
- A.C. Transit, Ward 5 - Diane Shaw, with reservations
- BART, District 4 - No Endorsement, please see write-up
- BART, District 6 - No Endorsement, please see write-up
- EBMUD, Ward 7 - No Endorsement, please see write-up
- EBRPD, Ward 5 - No Endorsement, please see write-up

**Statewide Propositions**
- 1 - Housing Assistance Bonds - Yes, with reservations
- 2 - Mental Illness Housing Bonds - No
- 3 - Water and Wildlife Bonds - No
- 4 - Children’s Hospitals Bonds - Yes, with reservations
- 5 - Property Tax Base Transfers - No
- 6 - Transportation Funding, Gas Taxes, Vehicle Fees - No
- 7 - Daylight Saving Time - Yes
- 8 - Kidney Dialysis Clinics - Yes
  - [Prop. 9 was removed from the ballot by court order]
- 10 - Local Authority to Enact Rent Control/Affordable Housing Act - Yes, Yes, Yes!
- 11 - Emergency Ambulance Employees - No, No, No!
- 12 - Farm Animals Confinement - Yes

**Local Measures**
- E - Peralta Parcel Tax Continuation - Yes, with reservations
- F - Alameda Services Sales Tax - No
- G - Peralta Sites/Facilities/Equipment Bond - Yes, with reservations
- H - Hayward School Bond - Yes, with bond reservations
- K - Alameda Weak Rent Control - No
- L - Albany Services Sales Tax - Yes, with reservations
- M - Albany Park and Open Space Parcel Tax - Yes, with reservations
- N - Albany Appointed Treasurer - Yes
- O - Berkeley Affordable Housing Bond - Yes
- P - Berkeley Homeless Services Tax - Yes
- Q - Berkeley Rent Ordinance Amendments - Yes
- R - Berkeley Vision 2050 Plan - Yes
- S - Emeryville Cannabis Business Tax - No endorsement
- T - Hayward Services Real Property Transfer Tax - Yes
- V - Oakland Cannabis Business Tax - Yes
- W - Oakland Homeless Services Vacant Property Tax - Yes
- X - Oakland Graduated Real Estate Transfer Tax - Yes, with reservations
- Y - Oakland Just Cause Eviction Amendments - Yes
- Z - Oakland Hotel Workers Workplace Protections and Wages - Yes
- AA - Oakland Education Parcel Tax Charter Amendment - No, No, No!
- DD - Union City Charter City and Real Property Transfer Tax - No
- FF - EBRPD Wildlife Protection and Parks Parcel Tax - No, with reservations

**Red the CANDIDATES’ QUESTIONNAIRES Online**

Most of the candidates returned our questionnaires, for most of the local races. You’ll find lots of additional info in the candidates’ completed questionnaires, so we strongly encourage you to read them on our website: http://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires/

Or, you can simply go to: http://acgreens.org, and then click on the “Candidate Questionnaires” tab near the top of the page.
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Hayward
Mayor - Barbara Halliday

Oakland
Mayor - #1: Saied Karamooz
; Sharing #2 & #3: Cat Brooks* and Pamela Price* [Don't vote for Schaaf]

City Council, District 4 - #1: Sheng Thao, #2: Pamela Harris, #3: Nayeli Maxson*, with reservations [Don't vote for Michelson]

Union City
New Haven School Board - Sarbjit Cheema

Special Districts:
A.C. Transit, Ward 4 - Nicholas Harvey

Statewide Propositions
6 - Transportation Funding, Gas Taxes, Vehicle Fees - No
8 - Kidney Dialysis Clinics - Yes
10 - Local Authority to Enact Rent Control/Affordable Housing Act - Yes, Yes, Yes!
11 - Emergency Ambulance Employees - No, No, No!

Local Measures:
K - Alameda Weak Rent Control - No
AA - Oakland Education Parcel Tax Charter Amendment - No, No!

Please see page 19 for the Full Voter Card!
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Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, and Insurance Commissioner

Superintendent of Public Instruction - [Don't vote for T uck]

Federal Offices

U.S. Representative, District 13 - Laura Wells

City Offices

Albany
City Council - Preston Jordan

Berkeley
City Council, District 1 - #1: Igor Tregub, #2: Mary Behm-Steinberg, #3: Margo Schueler, with reservations  [Don't vote for Kesarwani]
City Council, District 4 - Kate Harrison
City Council, District 7 - #1: Aidan Hill, #2: Rigel Robinson, #3: No endorsement, leave blank
City Council, District 8 - #1: Mary Kay Lacey, #2: Alfred Twu, with reservations, #3: Russ Tilleman, with reservations [Don't vote for Droste]

Read the CANDIDATES’ QUESTIONNAIRES!: See the Box on Page 14  •  Go PAPERLESS!: See the Front Page Box
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