Berkeley City Council, District 7
Aidan Hill (Write-in)

Vote for Aidan Hill. This former vice-chair of the homeless commission wants to provide not only essential services to the homeless, but to “get people into temporary accommodations, then motels, then Section 8 housing in the city.” Aidan favors pushing 100 percent affordable housing and knows that market-rate housing hinders affordability. Aidan Hill wants to strengthen rent control and eviction protections, and repeal Costa-Hawkins. Aidan states: “Most District 7 residents are renters and need strong protections to stay in their apartments, including subsidies and incentives to keep units rent-controlled for tenants and small landlords.” Aidan wants to shift police resources to mental health units, strengthen the Police Accountability Board, and ban less-than-lethal policing (tear gas, pepper spray, projectiles, smoke grenades, police dogs, etc). Aidan Hill promises “to provide public safety by legislating for emergency medical services, preserving open spaces for disaster prevention, and increasing safe-street outcomes.” With regard to climate change, Aidan believes this should be the “highest priority” and wants the city to “develop a tree campaign.” In terms of District 7 business: “I pledge to finance a Telegraph Business Improvement Union that invests in continued on page 8

Peralta Community Colleges

Three races, mostly in Oakland, also Piedmont, Emeryville

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

Three seats on the Peralta Board of Trustees are up for election in November. Two of three incumbents are not running for reelection: Linda Handy, first elected in 2002, and Julia Bonilla first elected in 2014. All of the candidates recognize the importance of community colleges; some started higher education at a community college. Based on responses to the Green questionnaire, all of the candidates showed awareness of current needs: administrative stability (hiring a permanent chancellor and administrative team), effective financial oversight, and wise class management (scheduling and when to cut under-enrolled classes). The state assures funding based on pre-pandemic levels through the 2024-2025 school year. After that, the state will return to the Student Centered Funding Formula, based on increases in student success. Some of the candidates wrote lengthy responses, reflecting considerable experience in education; others less so.

Peralta Board, Area 3
From San Antonio to Seminary, west of 580 to the Bay
Louis Quindlen

Louis Quindlen is the first retired Peralta faculty member we can remember running for Board election. He brings many years of educational experience and planning to the Peralta Board via a “Democracy Dollars” program; (2) amending campaign finance and lobbying rules; and (3) creating more transparency about campaign finance. Championed by the ACLU of Northern California, California Common Cause, the League of Women Voters and school board via a “Democracy Dollars” program; (2) amending campaign finance and lobbying rules; and (3) creating more transparency about campaign finance. Championed by the ACLU of Northern California, California Common Cause, the League of Women Voters and California Common Cause, the League of Women Voters and school board via a “Democracy Dollars” program; (2) amending campaign finance and lobbying rules; and (3) creating more transparency about campaign finance.
The Green Party of Alameda County

Locals:
Alameda County Green Sundays: 2nd Sundays, at 5 pm; Nibby-Proctor Library, 6501 Telegraph Ave. at 65th St., Oakland, or online. http://www.acgreens.wordpress.com.

(510) 644-2293

Albany and Berkeley Greens: We are working on a number of November candidate and ballot measure contests. For more information, please contact: acgreens1992@gmail.com or call: (510) 735-7361.

Oakland-Emeryville-Piedmont Green Party: We are working on November candidate and ballot measure contests. Please join us as soon as you possibly can.

East and South County Greens: We are looking for east and south Alameda County Greens interested in helping re-activate an East County and a South County local. If interested, please contact our office at acgreens1992@gmail.com.

Credits:
Our voter guide team includes: Kevin Akin, Peter Allen, David Arkin, Bill Balderson, Dale Baum, Paul Burton, Mica Daniel, Chris Finn, Kelly Hammargren, Greg Jan, Ralph Kanz, Liz Kraboth, Nick Maders, James McFadden, Ann Menasche, Justin Richardson, Phoebe Thomas Sorgen, Kent Sparring, Pam Spevack, and James Vann.

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:

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

We only endorse measures for essential public projects, or no position was warranted. Our endorsement “Yes, with standard bond reservations” reflects projects that are unlikely to be funded otherwise. Our endorsement “Yes, with reservations” reflects a lack of confidence in the likelihood of a candidate’s financial support during the endorsement process. The Green Party County Council voted not to accept contributions from for-profit corporations. If you have questions about our funding process, call us at (510) 644-2293.

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.

The Green Voter Guide
In 1992, the Green Party achieved ballot status in California and we’ve been fighting for a fairer tax system ever since. California can keep the good and fix the bad in Prop 13, but unfortunately, neither supermajority Democrats nor minority Republicans have used their power to promote and enact real solutions.

Regressive methods of funding public services include the following:

• BONDS have been sold to voters as “no new taxes” but should be called “spend now and make kids pay later, with interest.” Super-rich individuals and corporations, instead of paying taxes, lend money to the government in the form of bonds, and get even richer with interest. The good news is that a few years ago Sacramento passed a bill to allow publicly owned banks, which will enable California to use its own capital to fund public projects or then invest the interest back into the state and localities.

• PROPERTY TAXES, before Prop 13 in 1978, were due roughly eight months from the end of the fiscal year as opposed to commercial and industrial properties, but recently residential pays 72 percent and commercial pays a mere 28 percent. Homes are reassessed upon sale, whereas tax loopholes allow corporate properties to escape reassessment.

PARCEL TAXES are basically applied per property regardless of value, with small exemptions that are not nearly enough. Some residents of smaller properties now pay more in parcel taxes than they pay in basic property taxes.

SALES TAXES are another example of regressive taxes, and they incentivize governmental decisions in favor of shopping malls rather than needed affordable housing and open space.

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.

Taxes and Bonds: TAX THE RICH NOT JUST THE REST OF US

In this Green Voter Guide some measures may be endorsed as “Yes, with reservations.” Often it’s a good cause with bad funding. Such funding includes bonds, parcel taxes, sales taxes, and other regressive taxes that tax the rich individuals and corporations at lower rates than the rest of us.

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 it difficult to raise revenue and then invest the funds in the right places.

California budgeting took a turn for the worse in 1978 when Proposition 13 was approved by voters. The intention was to keep people, especially seniors on fixed incomes, from losing their homes due to escalating property taxes. Other less-understood parts of Prop 13 caused taxes overall to become less progressive and more regressive, damaging California’s legacy of great schools, parks, highways, health care and quality of life.

The “GAPC” is one of the few County Councils that produce a Voter Guide for each election. We mail about 5,000 to Green households, and distribute another 10,000 through cafes, BART stations, libraries and other locations. Please read yours and pass it along to other interested voters. Feel free to copy our “Voter Card” to distribute as it well.

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

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

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

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

Ways to reach us:
County Council: 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 acgreens1992@gmail.com
To get occasional announcements about current Green Party of Alameda County activities send an email to: acgreens1992@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:

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

We only endorse measures for essential public projects, or no position was warranted. Our endorsement “Yes, with standard bond reservations” reflects projects that are unlikely to be funded otherwise. Our endorsement “Yes, with reservations” reflects a lack of confidence in the likelihood of a candidate’s financial support during the endorsement process. The Green Party County Council voted not to accept contributions from for-profit corporations. If you have questions about our funding process, call us at (510) 644-2293.

Endorsements! Running a race?
If you’re interested in political analysis or campaigning, we could use your help. Or if you are wondering why we didn’t mention some of the local races, it may be because we didn’t have any information on candidates or groups in those races. Are you ready to start organizing your own local Green Party chapter or affinity group? Contact the Alameda County Green Party for assistance. We want to cultivate the party from the grassroots up.

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

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

On Election Day:
November 8, 2022

Green voter guide

State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Don’t vote for Christensen

In the June primary, the Green Party approached the race for the non partisan Superintendent of Public Instruction with considerable enthusiasm, supporting Marco Amoral. Regrettably, Amoral did not finish in the top two (actually, fifth, but with over a half million votes). We made the case for Amoral based on his anti-corporate, anti-racist program and contrasted him with the incumbent Tony Thurmond, whom we felt had been following the wrong course. For the current November election, Thurmond (who came in first in June by a large margin, but did not quite get 50 percent) is facing an opponent from the “populist right.” Lance Christensen is not advocating for an end to corporate domination, not even critical support, as will be explained below, but we must say clearly, “NO” to Christensen.

Thurmond served in the State Assembly (D-15) from 2015-2018. While not receiving many bills supportive of youth and the varied components of public education, as well as employee rights. He attempted to push a bill reigniting in charter schools. In addition, he advocated for a massive cut in expenditures (by OUSD’s own records, $1.3 billion over the last four years). For the current November election, Thurmond (who came in first in June by a large margin, but did not quite get 50 percent) is facing an opponent from the “populist right.” Lance Christensen is the voice for neo-liberal, privatizing forces through the California Policy Center and a consultant/strategist for the California State Charter School Association. While not receiving comparable Wall St./hedge fund show. He has served as an administrator for the conservative California Policy Center and a consultant/strategist for the California State Charter School Association.

Warmly, Green Party of Alameda County

Election Day: November 8, 2022

State Officers • State Assembly, Senate

Board of Equalization, District 2

Sally Lieber (Preferred, but not endorsed)

The Board of Equalization was created in 1879 to ensure that county assessors made honest, fully-valued assessments and avoided the temptation to cut the tax burden in their own counties. A few short years ago it was responsible for providing $11 billion above what was needed, but this year, but corruption scandals arose and the state legislature restructured it such that thereby it once had almost 5,000 employees, it now has just 400. Now it still retains its power to review property tax assessments and also insures taxpayer assessments. In addition, the Board maintains its role in the collection of alcohol, excise and pipeline taxes. The 2nd District includes all of the coastal northern and central California counties, and all of the Bay Area counties.

The Republican, Peter Verbitsa, is a poet with professional licenses from the California departments of Insurance and Real Estate. He is also a Certified Financial Planner, and has achieved impressive scores on the Adult Correction Officer Examination and the Law Enforcement Test Battery. He has dedicated his career to work in politics and public service, but has never held elected office.

Sally Lieber won a majority of the votes in the primary election, but per the “Top Two” rule, she still has to run again this November, likely challenged by the Democratic Socialists of America, and has been Mayor of Mountain View and a state Assembly member. She describes herself as a “corporate-free candidate” in her campaign statement, and is well-regarded by a number of Greens in northern Santa Clara County, the general area in which she has previously won office. Nevertheless, she remains registered with one of the two major corporate-dominated political parties, so therefore we cannot endorse her. However, since Lieber is a “corporate-free candidate,” we prefer for her to win the seat, rather than the Republican.

State Senate, District 20

Aisha Wahab (recommended, but not endorsed)

California’s 10th State Senate District represents Hayward, Fremont, North San Jose, and Sunnyvale. It is currently represented by Democrat Bob Wieckowski, who is termed out of office. Hayward City Councilmember Aisha Wahab returned our questionnaire, while Fremont Mayor Lily Mei did not.

Aisha Wahab is the at-large member of the Hayward City Council, elected in 2018. Wahab’s campaign website states that every person deserves a “roof over our heads, food on the table, a job with benefits, affordable education and healthcare, internet access, and clean air.” Councilmember Wahab was a member of the Alameda County Human Relations Commission and Public Health Commission and the Homeless and Housing Task Force in Hayward. As a council member, Wahab pushed for permanent affordable rental units and obtained grant funding for students and small businesses in Hayward. As a senator, Wahab will propose legislation for tuition free education and a public bank in California. She states that “every student deserves the opportunity for free, accessible, quality higher education.”

Aisha Wahab is endorsed by the Alameda Labor Council, the California Nurses Association (CNA), NARAL Pro-Choice, the California Teachers Association (CTA), and dozens of other organizations, plus at least two dozen local elected officials. The Green Party of Alameda County recommends Aisha Wahab for State Senate District 10, but because she

Become a Dues-Paying Green Party Member!

A number of Green Party groups around the country have started to ask for dues, not only as a way to raise money, but also to help foster group solidarity, commitment, and the like. So we’ve decided to try it out here in Alameda County.

We’ve decided on a sliding scale amount of $12 to $120 per year, but with waivers for financial need. The annual deadline for sending in your dues is December 12. (Quarterly or monthly is also fine.) So please become a dues-paying member now! You can either mail a check to: Green Party, 2022 Blake St., Berkeley, CA 94704, or you can donate online at: https://acgreens.wordpress.com/donate/ (Feel free to use the coupon on page 5 of this newsletter!) Or, look for “Pay Me!” on your invoice. (Note: Neither your voting nor your participation rights will be affected by the payment, or non-payment, of these dues.)

Thank you so much, in advance, for your support, in becoming a dues-paying member!

Warmly, Green Party of Alameda County

State Assembly, Dist. 20

No endorsement

Assembly District (AD) 20 covers Dublin, Castro Valley, Hayward, Union City, San Leandro and west Pleasanton. Our preferred candidate in the June primary election, Jennifer Esteen, an organizer with SEIU, did not finish in the top two; those being Liz Ortega Toro and Shawn Kumagai.

Kumagai, a Dublin city council member, ran largely on identity issues (being both an Asian American and a veteran). He prioritizes affordable housing and transit equity issues.

Ortega Toro, who finished far ahead of Kumagai, is a different kind of candidate. While not receiving any endorsements, qualified by her close linkage to the “liberal” Democratic Party establishment, especially the Bonta “machine”. She is secretary treasurer of the Alameda Labor Council and has massive union support, beginning with the teachers union (CTA) and including AFSCME (her union), the nurses (CNA), UNITE-HERE, et al.

We do not hold any progressive positions, on free higher education, Medicare for All/statewide single payer, strong rent control (including repeal of the Ellis Act and Costa Hawkins), support for public banks, defense of public education, drug legalization, and public financing of elections.

The big problem is her strong advocacy of the Alameda Labor Council’s “Save Our Jobs” campaign advocating for the retirement of PG&E. Since PG&E is based out of San Francisco, but not endorsed)

Given this shameful situation, we thought much about what our position should be regarding the statewide partisan races for the November election. We recommend that people BOYCOTT these contests. Specifically, the following 8 statewide offices: Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, and U.S. Senator. And for similar reasons, also the northern Alameda county congressional and state legislature races.

For information, please note that specific information about the candidates running in these races was provided in our June primary Voter Guide: http://acgreens.wordpress.com/voter-guides/.

Boycotting the statewide partisan races is not much of a sacrifice, since only candidates of the two major wings of the money party will be on the ballot. We hope that a visible drop in the vote totals in these races will make a statement about these partisan races. In addition, the state of California, as the Green Party has done for many years, needs also to start looking at proven alternatives to the failing electoral system we presently have. The Green Party uses the Proportional Representation election system with great success, and with high voter turnout that often exceeds 80 percent.

We do not want to be absolutely clear that we are NOT asking people not to vote at all. There are important ballot measures and worthwhile local candidates who are worth voting for.

So please DO VOTE—but with the exception of the above-listed statewide (and northern Alameda county) partisan races!
There are four California Supreme Court Justices facing retention elections this year: Joshua Groban, Patricia Guerrero, Martin Jenkins, and Goodwin Liu. All four are experienced judges, each representing a somewhat different legal philosophy, and none are particularly radical or erratic. As a group, they are reason- ably diverse, except in their pre-judge legal backgrounds, which do tend towards large corporate-serving law firms and law schools.

But this is just a retention or confirmation election of justices already on the court, and not an election to the court, we believe it is most appropriate not to attack those who have been retained in an uncontested election. Rather than engage in the hyper-politicization of the judiciary that is occurring at the national level, we think California should retain its civility, and retain all four of these justices.

**State Courts of Appeal, First District**

No endorsements

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

To review every opinion that the District appellate judicial candidates will join over the past year in a manner currently beyond the capacity of our Voter Guide volunteer staff. We are therefore not endorsing either a “Yes” or a “No” vote on the retention/confirmation of the state appellate judges on the ballot. Press accounts of state appellate court judicial holdings are relatively rare, and reviewing the opinions authored or joined by each during their twelve-year terms would require several months, if not years, of dedicated research.

Since 1998 the Green Party has criticized the Gov- ernor’s judicial appointment system in which special interest groups and money from the private sector that must ratify an appointment is often a mere rubber stamp. Prosecutors, supported by police and prison guards, have exercised an undue influence on this outdated judicial se- lection process. Judges are drawn primarily from a narrow band of the political spectrum, heavily weighted toward law-and-order/war-on-drugs cheerleaders, large corporate law firms, retired military and those with tenures in a low court. Racism and sexism are rampant. The present system of judicial selection does nothing to elevate the standards of judicial qualifications. Californians deserve to have confi- dence in the judges that will decide their fate.

In 2017 and 2019 all three candidates were endorsed by the California Professional Referee Organization (CPT). Concerns about their judicial qualifications and judicial ethics are extremely serious. As a result, the Green Party is refusing to endorse any of the judicial candidates.

**Peralta Colleges**

continued from page 1

For the rank and file to really have a voice in local court cases, the public must have a say in the kind of justices that are elected. The Green Party is working to establish an independent, fact-based, data-driven merit commission that will be responsible for selecting judges. The merit commission will conduct an exhaustive evaluation of applicants, taking into account their qualifications, experience, and commitment to public service. As a result, the Green Party is endorsing a strong judicial oversight agency.

**Peralta Colleges — Dual endorsement:**

Cindi Reiss and Saleem Gilmore

Incumbent Cindi Napoli-Atela Reiss defeated long- time Peralta Board member Bill Riley (first elected in 1998) in 2018. Four years ago, we supported her. She was the first Asian American woman to be elected to the Board. Cindi was re-elected last year and serves on the Presidents’ Council. Over the years, Cindi has been a committed advocate for the rights of students and faculty, and has been a listening ear to those who need her help.

Cindi, who was born in San Francisco and lives in Piedmont, is an attorney and has served on the Alameda County Board of Education. She has been a community leader, and has the expertise and courage needed to make difficult decisions and ensure that our schools are safe and equitable.

Shaleem Gilmore is a newcomer running for Peralta Board. Shaleem is a native of Oakland and has a passion for social justice and education. He has an extensive background in education, and serves on the Alameda County Board of Education. Shaleem is a strong advocate for the rights of students and faculty, and has the experience and commitment to public service to improve our public schools.

Reiss is endorsed by Peralta Trustee Bill Withrow; Julia Bonilla, recently retired Peralta Trustee; Oakland Mayor Libby Schaaf; President Sheng Thao; Mia suffering the California Commission on Judicial Performance and passing legislation to increase its transparency and ac- knowledges that of the California's Courts of Appeal whose removal would have been initiated by equivalent commissions in other states.

Court Reform LLC found that of all states California had the highest level of perceived illegal corruption in its judicial branch. Californians deserve to have confidence in their courts, but a 2014 study by Court Reform LLC found that of all states California had the highest level of perceived illegal corruption in its judicial branch.

The Green Party has supported renewed scrutiny of the judicial selection process. Judges are drawn primarily from a narrow band of the political spectrum, heavily weighted toward law-and-order/war-on-drugs cheerleaders, large corporate law firms, retired military and those with tenures in a low court. Racism and sexism are rampant. The present system of judicial selection does nothing to elevate the standards of judicial qualifications. Californians deserve to have confidence in the judges that will decide their fate.

In 2017 and 2019 all three candidates were endorsed by the California Professional Referee Organization (CPT). Concerns about their judicial qualifications and judicial ethics are extremely serious. As a result, the Green Party is refusing to endorse any of the judicial candidates.

Whether Green candidates are elected or not, we are committed to increasing the transparency and accountability of the judicial branch. As a result, the Green Party is endorsing a strong judicial oversight agency.

**Peralta Colleges — Dual endorsement:**

Cindi Reiss and Saleem Gilmore

Incumbent Cindi Napoli-Atela Reiss defeated long- time Peralta Board member Bill Riley (first elected in 1998) in 2018. Four years ago, we supported her. She was the first Asian American woman to be elected to the Board. Cindi was re-elected last year and serves on the Presidents’ Council. Over the years, Cindi has been a committed advocate for the rights of students and faculty, and has been a listening ear to those who need her help.

Cindi, who was born in San Francisco and lives in Piedmont, is an attorney and has served on the Alameda County Board of Education. She has been a community leader, and has the expertise and courage needed to make difficult decisions and ensure that our schools are safe and equitable.

Shaleem Gilmore is a newcomer running for Peralta Board. Shaleem is a native of Oakland and has a passion for social justice and education. He has an extensive background in education, and serves on the Alameda County Board of Education. Shaleem is a strong advocate for the rights of students and faculty, and has the experience and commitment to public service to improve our public schools.

Reiss is endorsed by Peralta Trustee Bill Withrow; Julia Bonilla, recently retired Peralta Trustee; Oakland Mayor Libby Schaaf; President Sheng Thao; Mia suffering the California Commission on Judicial Performance and passing legislation to increase its transparency and ac- knowledges that of the California's Courts of Appeal whose removal would have been initiated by equivalent commissions in other states.

Court Reform LLC found that of all states California had the highest level of perceived illegal corruption in its judicial branch. Californians deserve to have confidence in their courts, but a 2014 study by Court Reform LLC found that of all states California had the highest level of perceived illegal corruption in its judicial branch.

The Green Party has supported renewed scrutiny of the judicial selection process. Judges are drawn primarily from a narrow band of the political spectrum, heavily weighted toward law-and-order/war-on-drugs cheerleaders, large corporate law firms, retired military and those with tenures in a low court. Racism and sexism are rampant. The present system of judicial selection does nothing to elevate the standards of judicial qualifications. Californians deserve to have confidence in the judges that will decide their fate.

In 2017 and 2019 all three candidates were endorsed by the California Professional Referee Organization (CPT). Concerns about their judicial qualifications and judicial ethics are extremely serious. As a result, the Green Party is refusing to endorse any of the judicial candidates.

Whether Green candidates are elected or not, we are committed to increasing the transparency and accountability of the judicial branch. As a result, the Green Party is endorsing a strong judicial oversight agency.
However, a key part of our questionnaire was the issue of money bail reform, and the role it should play in reforming our criminal justice system. Price strongly favors money bail reform. Wiley (who did not return our questionnaire) does not address bail reform on his campaign website indicating this is not a priority, or that he favors the current money bail system as a mechanism to obtain DA plea-bargains. Since money bail is highly coercive and discriminatory, often forcing poor families to choose between a guilty plea to a crime they did not commit or the psychological and economic hardship of remaining in jail for an extended period of time awaiting trial, the lack of a clear position on money bail excluded Wiley from consideration of our endorsement.

Pamela Price has a very strong legal background and commitment to civil rights, and early in her career she worked as a criminal defense attorney. For at least the last 30 years, her practice has been in civil litigation, particularly employment litigation, rather than criminal law. At the same time, however, she clearly has a sophisticated understanding of the criminal justice system, and presents a detailed and comprehensive platform both on her website and in response to our questionnaire. Price also has an impressive and progressive list of endorsements, including Angela Davis. Price is a member of the Alameda County Democratic party Central Committee. Based on her responses to our questionnaire, her interest in reform of the criminal justice system, and in particular reform of the predatory bail system, we believe Pamela Price is the best candidate to shake up a system, and in particular reform of the predatory bail system, and presents her strongly as the most progressive justice system, presents a detailed and comprehensive platform, and clearly has a sophisticated understanding of the criminal justice system, and in particular reform of the predatory bail system.

In summary, the Green Party endorses Pamela Price.

Terry Wiley is a veteran prosecutor whose entire legal career (30 years) was in the Alameda County District Attorney’s Office, therefore he is embedded in that system. We examined his website which indicates leadership and management experience within that system. However we found no mention of bail reform which is a disqualification for our Green Party endorsement. Mr. Wiley seems to have backed the establishment Democratic Party machine as evidenced by listing numerous politicians, backing from police and sheriff organizations, and backing from construction and realtors. A vote for Terry Wiley appears to be a vote for our Green Party endorsement. Mr. Wiley seems to have worked as a criminal defense attorney. For at least the last 30 years, her practice has been in civil litigation, particularly employment litigation, rather than criminal law. At the same time, however, she clearly has a sophisticated understanding of the criminal justice system, and presents a detailed and comprehensive platform both on her website and in response to our questionnaire. Price also has an impressive and progressive list of endorsements, including Angela Davis. Price is a member of the Alameda County Democratic party Central Committee. Based on her responses to our questionnaire, her interest in reform of the criminal justice system, and in particular reform of the predatory bail system, we believe Pamela Price is the best candidate to shake up a system, and in particular reform of the predatory bail system, and presents her strongly as the most progressive justice system, and in particular reform of the predatory bail system.

In summary, the Green Party endorses Pamela Price.

Alameda County has some 1.6 million people. The five members of the Alameda County Board of Supervisors (BOS) oversee an operating budget of some $3.6 billion. The County employs almost 10,000 people in twenty-one different agencies and departments, with executive authority placed in a County Administrator, appointed by and responsible to the Board.

The County BOS has many important responsibilities such as welfare and health care services, and nominal oversight over the Sheriff, District Attorney, and other departments. Yet it consistently flies below the radar, receiving much less scrutiny than the Oakland, Berkeley, and many other City Councils. Most of the time (prior to the pandemic) the County BOS meeting room was empty, except for businesses who want money from the County. When progressive issues come before the Board, they rarely attract protestors with demands. As a result, the County BOS is even more impervious to being influenced than the City Councils.

A consequence of flying under the radar is the recurrent lack of competition for the office. In the June primary election, just as it was four and eight years ago, District 2 Supervisor Richard Valle again ran unopposed. But because the District 3 appointed Supervisor, Dave Brown, wasn’t eligible to run, since he hadn’t lived in the District for at least two years, there’s a very rare open seat for this contest, which was previously held by Wilma Chan from 1994-2000 (before being elected to the state legislature) and again from 2010 until she died last November after being hit by a car.

Of the four June primary candidates for this seat—Rebecca Kaplan, Lena Tam, David Kakishiba, and Sur- lene Grant—three returned the Green Party questionnaire (Kaplan, Kakishiba, and Grant), but Tam did not. And only Kaplan provided detailed answers to most or all of the questions.

Kaplan is currently the At-Large Councilperson for Oakland, serving since 2008 and before that on the AC Transit Board. She has served as Oakland’s representative on the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Board. Tam was a Councilperson and Vice Mayor in Alameda, from 2006-2014, and before that a County Planning Commissioner and Chair. Each of the candidates has a website (Kaplan is by far the most detailed). The priorities of each candidate, as specified on their websites are:

Rebecca Kaplan: Community Safety; Public Health and Hospitals; Transportation and Environment; Housing and Homelessness; Economic Opportunity; Lela Tam (The website has no Priorities tab, this is taken from the Issues tab: Safe and Sustainable Transportation; Environmental Protection; Public Safety; Poverty and Homelessness; Healthcare.

While none of the candidates is proposing radical (and necessary, if this planet is to remain hospitable to human life) change, based on website information and questionaire answers (when provided), it seems that Rebecca Kaplan could be the most progressive of the candidates, and most aligned with the Green Party’s values. She is clearly the one with the most experience, especially dealing with large bureaucracies. Whether she would be the most effective as a sitting Supervisor is harder to say.

We think, anecdotally, Kaplan could and should have done more to advance progressive policies and Green Party priorities as a long-time Oakland City Council member and, for some of that time, as President of the Council. Whether another candidate could have done (as a thought experiment) done better in the muck that has been and continues to be the Oakland City Council, we simply cannot say.

With these things in mind, we endorse, with reservations, Rebecca Kaplan for the Alameda County Board of Supervisors District 3 seat.

Alameda County Measure D raises more questions than it answers. The measure allows for development of equestrian and agricultural facilities like horse arenas and winery related structures that exceed the limits of the urban growth limits imposed by the Measure D that was passed in 2000. The County has decided that no environmental review is needed for this measure and buses most of that conclusion on the 1994 Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the East County Area Plan. That out of date document does not analyze Greenhouse Gas Emissions or Wildfire impacts of the project, which were not requirements at the time it was prepared.

The County did prepare an addendum to the previous EIR that says none of the impacts of the new Measure D are significant and therefore no further environmental review is required. However, one goal of Measure D is to promote more vineyard development in the South Livermore Valley, but the addendum analysis does not adequately consider that we are in a drought, so where will the water come from for more thirsty vines? Plus, nowhere in the Addendum is there any mention of meeting the climate goals of the East Alameda County Conservation Strategy that provides minimum mitigation requirements for threatened and endangered species resulting from development in that part of the County. Since the environmental review process should never be condensed and therefore we recommend a No vote on Measure D.

Alameda County Measure D raises more questions than it answers. The measure allows for development of equestrian and agricultural facilities like horse arenas and winery related structures that exceed the limits of the urban growth limits imposed by the Measure D that was passed in 2000. The County has decided that no environmental review is needed for this measure and buses most of that conclusion on the 1994 Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the East County Area Plan. That out of date document does not analyze Greenhouse Gas Emissions or Wildfire impacts of the project, which were not requirements at the time it was prepared.

The County did prepare an addendum to the previous EIR that says none of the impacts of the new Measure D are significant and therefore no further environmental review is required. However, one goal of Measure D is to promote more vineyard development in the South Livermore Valley, but the addendum analysis does not adequately consider that we are in a drought, so where will the water come from for more thirsty vines? Plus, nowhere in the Addendum is there any mention of meeting the climate goals of the East Alameda County Conservation Strategy that provides minimum mitigation requirements for threatened and endangered species resulting from development in that part of the County. Since the environmental review process should never be condensed and therefore we recommend a No vote on Measure D.

Alameda County Measure D raises more questions than it answers. The measure allows for development of equestrian and agricultural facilities like horse arenas and winery related structures that exceed the limits of the urban growth limits imposed by the Measure D that was passed in 2000. The County has decided that no environmental review is needed for this measure and buses most of that conclusion on the 1994 Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the East County Area Plan. That out of date document does not analyze Greenhouse Gas Emissions or Wildfire impacts of the project, which were not requirements at the time it was prepared.

The County did prepare an addendum to the previous EIR that says none of the impacts of the new Measure D are significant and therefore no further environmental review is required. However, one goal of Measure D is to promote more vineyard development in the South Livermore Valley, but the addendum analysis does not adequately consider that we are in a drought, so where will the water come from for more thirsty vines? Plus, nowhere in the Addendum is there any mention of meeting the climate goals of the East Alameda County Conservation Strategy that provides minimum mitigation requirements for threatened and endangered species resulting from development in that part of the County. Since the environmental review process should never be condensed and therefore we recommend a No vote on Measure D.
Albany’s First Ranked Choice Voting Election! In 2020 Albany Voters passed Measure BB, bringing Ranked Choice Voting (RCV) to our City Council and Board of Education. Albany Greens endorsed this measure making Albany’s elections more representative of the votes and preferences of its voters. RCV has been recognized as one means of bringing at-large (non-Districted) elected councils such as Albany’s into compliance with the California Voting Rights Act. In this year’s election the three open Board of Education seats are being filled by three candidates running unopposed, so even though only half of the City Council has more candidates than seats, voters will be asked to rank the candidates for school board as well.

Shout out to the City of Albany for creating this information guide. https://www.albany.org/departments/city-clerk/election-information/ranked-choice-voting

Albany City Council – Five Candidates for Two Open Seats

Robin Pérez: Rank #1: Robin moved to UC Village to pursue a Ph.D. at UC Berkeley, and has since put down roots and is raising his family here. He led mental health programs for homeless individuals in conjunction with the American Foundation for Suicide Prevention and received the White House Presidential Volunteer Service Award. Robin serves on the Albany Social & Economic Justice Commission. He is committed to creating opportunities, gaining access to basic needs and mental health resources, and developing equitable and sustainable new infrastructure and services.

In regards to climate action, he states, “We are in a global climate crisis, and Albany is no exception to the consequences. As a dedicated scientist and ecologist, much of my life work centers around ensuring the ecological integrity of our planet, while finding balance with human needs and survival. Albany has the power and opportunity to position itself as both a regional and state leader in climate policy and action.” Robin’s background in ecology, identity and lived experiences situate within the key values outlined by the Green Party, particularly around ecological wisdom, social justice, and respect for diversity.

John Miki: Rank #2: An Albany resident since 2005, John Miki first served in 2010 on the Traffic and Safety Commission (now Transportation Commission), and worked to pass Albany’s first Active Transportation Plan. As an urban designer and architect he brought experience in subject knowledge, consensus building, and an ability to balance the aspirational dreams of the community with short term implementable changes. He now serves on the Climate Action Committee. John moved Albany forward to a more sustainable and resilient future.

John’s approach to leadership embodies the 10 Key Values of the Green Party. With this statement regarding nonviolence: “To move beyond the current state of violence in politics and in the ability to dialog between opposing groups, we must start with empathy and trust. Empathy to take a moment and listen and hear where a person is coming from. Trust to understand that solutions can be found that are not winners take all.” He endorses his candidacy for many reasons, but his note here sums them up.

You Rank: Rankings #3 thru #5: Jeremiah Garrett-Pinguelo, Jennifer Hanson-Romero, Nick Pilch: You Rank - Like much of the Bay Area, Albany is fortunate all the candidates for the City Council embody progressive values and deep or deeper shades of Green. Any of them would be a fine city council member, so we leave it to voters to rank them—with a reminder that these votes will count if your first and second choices don’t have a majority in the first round of counting—and we endorse all five of the candidates without reservation.

Jeremiah Garrett-Pinguelo: Jeremiah is a community organizer and fund-sets the Run a Mile Food Bank & Houseless Laundry Program. He is the Community Outreach Organizer for UC Berkeley, serving on the Unfair Housing Practices Commission and makes a 2018 completed questionnaire where Ri

Albany School Board No endorsements

This year, there are three open school board seats. We were informed by Lucy Baird of her withdrawal from the campaign, although that happened too late to have her name removed from the ballot. The remaining three candidates then decided not to seek endorsements, or reply to questions. In light of this, we are not endorsing or advising against any of the candidates, and instead urge Albany voters to visit the City of Albany website (https://www.albany.org/) > City Clerk > 2022 Election Information > Candidates, and read each candidate’s statement.

For Ron Rosenbaum: https://www.albany.org/home/showpublisheddocument/52019/6379641727010000

For Sadia Kahn: https://www.albany.org/home/showpublisheddocument/52026/6379641569973000

For Becky Hopwood: https://www.albany.org/home/showpublisheddocument/52023/6379641669973000

Albany Measure K: Medical Services and Fire Protection Special Tax Yes, with parcel tax reservations

Albany has one measure on the ballot; the Green Party endorses it with reservations: Measure K: Special Emergency Medical Services, Advanced Life Support, and Fire Protection Special Tax Increase: Currently, the City of Albany imposes an Emergency Medical Services Special Tax and a Paramedic Advanced Life Support Fire Engines and Ambulance Service Special Tax: Measure K would replace these two special taxes with a tax on fund paramedic, advanced life support, firefighting services, fighting equipment and ambulance service within the City. It creates a special tax at the maximum rate of $0.074 per square foot of land used for residential and commercial properties to be operative for fiscal year 2023-2024 and each fiscal year thereafter, subject to an annual adjustment for inflation capped at 5 percent of the tax rates imposed by the City in the prior fiscal year. The Measure exempts residential parcels owned by qualifying very-low-income residents from the tax, and allows qualifying very-low-income renters to apply for a rebate of the special tax. The Albany Fire Marshal notes passage of this measure will help fund equipment specific to protection of large affordable housing projects.

Based on parcel size rather than the flat per-parcel ones it replaces, Measure K is somewhat progressive, as property values often parallel lot size, and larger commercial properties will pay significantly more than the current $113.50 per parcel financed equivalent. Albany’s current measure at 2500 square feet will only see their rate increase by roughly $70. Accounting for apartments and condominiums, the average increased cost per residence will be roughly $1 per week.

As we stated before, our reservations stem from inequities created by Proposition 13 coupled with the state’s squeeze on local governments, and the need to use devices such as sales and parcel taxes to fill these shortfalls. How much a parcel taxes squeeze on local governments, and the need to use devices such as sales and parcel taxes to fill these shortfalls. How much a parcel tax. The Albany Fire Marshal notes passage of this measure will help fund equipment specific to protection of large affordable housing projects.

Berkeley's voters, protecting, democratic decision-making and equitable living wages. With this progressive agenda, the election of Aaidan would help the conservative Berkeley City Council back to the Left.

Aoidan’s District 7 opponent is Rogeril Robinson, the incumbent. Rigel did not respond to multiple requests to complete our 2022 Voter Guide Questionnaire. However, we did have his 2018 completed questionnaire where Rigel focused on property rights and his promise to push for “taller, denser buildings around campus.” He has seemed to go his own path, although this was primarily a UC desire for a City Council. And housing prices keep climbing. Four years ago Rigel only favored building “some market rate housing,” however his pro-developer votes on Council since then show that he is in lock-step with our Mayor and City to push for a pro-developer camp. It is hard to think of any independent action by this mayoral puppet. In a District heavily populated with students who need housing protection, it would be great to see the Democratic Party make a real effort and replace him with a Green progressive candidate willing to stand up against the establishment and put “people before profits” in the crises of climate and housing. We recommend a vote for Aaidan Hill.

Berkeley Auditor

Jenny Wong

Berkeley Auditor Jenny Wong After being elected City Auditor in 2018, Jenny Wong is running unopposed. For those unfamiliar with her duties, per the City of Berkeley web page, the Auditor provides an independent assessment of whether City funded services and operations: 1) Are managed properly and in compliance with laws and regulations. 2) Achieve their objectives and desired outcomes. 3) Are being provided efficiently, economically and effectively.

As the city watchdog, Jenny Wong has performed well earning our trust and a big thumbs up recommendation. Jenny Wong is a bay area Berkeley resident who has 22 years of experience in the government auditing field including the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO), and the last 4 years as the Berkeley City Auditor. Her responses to our questions (https://jenny.wong.wordpress.com/page/3/) are informative, comprehensive and effective:

Berkeley City Council, District 1

#1: Tamar Michai Freeman

 ranked (but not endorsed) [DO NOT rank Keswarsani]

We strongly recommend ranking Tamar Michai Free-

man #1 for Berkeley City Council District 1. She would represent a significant shift on the Council, replacing a conservative incumbent who is a Republican in a very liberal city. Keeping a progressive with a progressive who is concerned about “inequities and systemic discriminatory practices that continue to require our focus and commitment.” Tamar is an advocate of “Housing that is truly affordable and retains its affordability for our families, working-class families, and students.” She supports TOPA, the Rent Board, repeal of Costa-Hawkins, and 100 percent affordable housing at BART. “Public land should be for the benefit of the people.” Ms. Freeman favors Measure M, the tax on vacant rentals, but is against Measure L, the catch-all exorbitant bond. “Why is the City Council asking residents to pay for something this time to agree to this bond amount?... many residents do not trust the City Council will spend funds in a transparent manner.” On budgets, she thinks remaining ARPA funds (COVID relief) should be used to increase “continued on page 7
Berkeley City Council
continued from page 6

Katherine Harrison
Berkeley City Council, District 4

Katherine Harrison is the incumbent Council Member for District 4, winning her seat in a special election in 2017 and holistically advocates for regular meetings, evidence-based policies, and strong, meaningful protection of tenant rights. Harrison is running unopposed. She was a stealth candidate in 2018, unknown at City Council meetings. She did not return our candidate questionnaires. Four years ago, she evaded direct answers in a Berkeley Neighborhood Association and as a commissioner on our Peer Review Commission meetings. Based on her responses, Ms. Mikiten would be an improvement over Keswari, but is far inferior to Ms. Freeman.

Khalil Rashedi, 1 Blaisdell Ln Dryden
Rascal/CA

No, No, No!

Election Day: November 8, 2022

City Offices & Measures: Berkeley

Berkeley School Board
Jennifer Shanowski, Ka’Dijah A. Brown, and Mike Chang

There are three openings on Berkeley’s School Board. We endorse these fine candidates: Jennifer Shanowski, Ka’Dijah A. Brown, and Mike Chang (District 8). Jennifer Shanowski is a Berkeley resident of the past and present Berkeley political establishment, a former president of the Berkeley Education Association, and a commissioner on our City Transportation, Public Works, and Fair Campaign Practices Commission. Jennifer Shanowski decided to run because “it’s time to represent the city’s minority students, promoting small businesses and addressing homelessness.” She supports a minimum of 50 percent affordable housing in city government projects. Jennifer Shanowski is critical of the City’s housing code, which she believes “regulates poor people out of the market.” She advocates for the City to require developers to include affordable units in new developments.

Kimberly Quinn
Berkeley School Board, District 8

Kimberly Quinn is the incumbent District 8 School Board member. She was a stealth candidate in 2018, unknown at City Council meetings. She did not return our candidate questionnaires. Four years ago, she evaded direct answers in a Berkeley Neighborhood Association and as a commissioner on our Peer Review Commission meetings. Based on her responses, Ms. Mikiten would be an improvement over Keswari, but is far inferior to Ms. Freeman.
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The argument against Measure L is that the promise made is not a specification of where the bond money will be spent. The text of Measure L does not define the timing of the bond sales nor the amount of the bonds to be sold at any time and instead states, “The dates of sale and the amount of bonds sold at any given time will be determined by the City based on need for funds and other factors.” An 18-year time spread for selling the bonds and no specific project commitments, it is unknown who will be making the decisions or for what over the next few years. It is unknown how the bond money will be spent or for what specific projects or projects of categories of projects.

The text of Measure L does not define the timing of the bond sales nor the amount of the bonds to be sold at any time and instead states, “The dates of sale and the amount of bonds sold at any given time will be determined by the City based on need for funds and other factors.” With an 18-year time spread for selling the bonds and no specific project commitments, it is unknown who will be making the decisions or for what over the next few years. It is unknown how the bond money will be spent or for what specific projects or projects of categories of projects.

Both the argument for Measure L and the rebuttal to the argument against Measure L, promise that the measure establishes an Oversight Committee. However, with no guarantee that any specific amounts will be spent on any particular project or projects, this is the only thing that broadly fits the imagination qualifies.

More troubling to the promise of oversight is the current and ongoing complaints coming from the Disaster Recovery Action Committee for measures N (Vacancy Tax and GG) and the Homeless Panel of Experts (oversight for Measure P the tax for homeless Services). At issue is not receiving the necessary information in a timely manner if at all, so oversight is thwarted.

Last, with no commitment to any project, there is no assurance that the money spent will actually provide the infrastructure upgrades and replacements needed for a rapidly changing, unstable climate future. The only commitment made in Measure L is that however, the bond money is spent, the residents of Berkeley will be paying for the bond debt service, either directly through property taxes or indirectly, until 2070/2071 with the “best estimate” of that debt service cost as $1,125,000,000! Are they nuts?

Vote NO, a billion times no!

Berkeley Measure M - YES
Vacancy Tax

This sensible measure has been needed and discussed for decades. Brava to Councilmember Kate Harrison for Measure M which will get many of Berkeley’s approximately 120 empty rental units back on the market by taxing the owners for each empty unit in yearly increasing increments until they are rented. The tax is directed primarily to corporate landlords who leave units and entire buildings empty, sometimes for decades. There are many exclusions for small landlords who reserve a single unit or two for personal use or to provide housing for family members. The tax will put more needed rental units back on the market, cut down on the blight of empty buildings scattered around our city, and generate $3.9 to $5.9 million in annual revenue for the City which, hopefully, will be used to construct affordable housing and not be diverted to corporate profits for housing and low-income households. For details, see: https://vacancytax/berkeley.org/

We strongly recommend voting YES on M.

Berkeley Measure N - YES
Public Low-Rent Housing

Per the City Attorney’s analysis, Measure N authorizes government entities to “develop, construct or acquire an additional 3,000 units of low income housing in the City of Berkeley for low income persons. This measure grants only general authority for units to be developed, constructed or acquired and does not approve any individual project.”

More low-income housing is definitely needed, so approving Measure N is obvious, as no public low-income housing can be built through a bond. However, the measure does not require governmental developers generally will not build low-income housing without governmental involvement. Vote YES on Measure N.

Emeryville School Board continued from page 1

ery is often compared with, the West Contra Costa Unified School District, which includes the cities of Richmond and San Pablo, was able to increase their scores proportionately, even more than did Oakland, over the same time period.

Fortunately, Brian Donahue, who has been an activist on Board of Ed issues for many years, offers an alternative to the failures of the current Board. Donahue was a co-founder of Residents United for a Livable Emeryville (RUF), which was able to elect every City Council member during their 14-year existence, but which came to a close earlier this year after having been sidelined by the pandemic over the past two years. He is also the publisher of the Emeryville Tattler blog and a longtime Green Party member. In his questionnaire answers, Donahue writes, “I would empower teachers. Change the culture so that the administration morphs into a teacher helping culture…Long term I would look into melding Emery with Pittsburg School District. Not only to absorb the high level academic success of that District but also to ameliorate the high costs associated with operating a stand alone School District that makes Emeryville a “kiddie table.”

Donahue also wants to get “major corporations in Emeryville to commit to supporting the schools with a special emphasis on Disney/Pixar.” He notes that Disney/Pixar should have been the money promised to the District by the 2004 community plebiscite (Measures T and U) where a quid pro quo corporate campus expansion approval from voters came with a promise to be a benefactor for Emeryville schools,” but that “money never materialized.”

Donahue also states that in 2017, the Emery School District dropped from the 4th worst in Alameda county to “the bottom that year and it has remained on the bottom. This school board should not be running for re-election with that terrible record.” We agree—it’s time to replace the Board. Vote YES for Brian Donahue, and not for any of the three incumbents.

Do you have QUESTIONS about Registration, your Ballot, or Voting? Please call the Registrar of Voters: (510) 272-6973 or check the Secretary of State’s website: https://www.sos.ca.gov/elections

City Offices & Measures: Berkeley, Emeryville

Berkeley Measure L continued from page 7

It is because Berkeley’s incompetent management that has over the years neglected to repave streets and infrastructure, which have been neglected for years. From the Auditor’s Report under City Manager: “To address rising costs for unmet capital needs, we recommend that the City enter into a formal agreement with the Public Works Department to implement a funding plan aimed at (1) reducing the City’s unfunded capital and deferred maintenance needs, and (2) ensuring regular maintenance of city assets to prevent excessive deferred maintenance costs in the future.”

But Measure L is a grab bag with a laundry list of possible expenditures and a commitment to none. The most important sentence in the entire Measure L text is found in Section 4. Estimated Cost of Improvements. This statement follows a list that sounds like a commitment with, “These dollar amounts are estimates and are not a commitment or guarantee that any specific amounts will be spent on particular projects or categories of projects.”

Emeryville City Council
Eugene Tssui, with reservations
 Sukhdeep Kaur, with reservations

We are disappointed only three out of five Emeryville city council candidates chose to respond to our questionnaire, Eugene Tssui, Sukhdeep Kaur and Eugene Tssui, who completed our questionnaire. Nonetheless, this proposed real estate transfer tax in Emeryville, we think Eugene Tssui and Sukhdeep Kaur will serve as a reminder to Emeryville city hall has more than one duty to the people.

The Green Party recommends Eugene Tssui and Sukhdeep Kaur for Emeryville city council.

Emeryville Measure O - Yes, with reservations
Real Property Transfer Tax Increase

Emeryville voters are being asked to increase the tax rate upon sale for all real property in excess of $1 million and for property sold above $2,000,000. The rate is currently charged. Measure O’s is relatively progressive and would modify Berkeley’s existing real estate transfer rate tax of $12 per $1000 in property sales and increase it to $15 for sales between $1,000,000 and $2,000,000 and $25 per $1,000 for property sales above $2,000,000. Property sold for less than $1 million would remain unchanged.

Measure O would deliver more revenue to a city that very much needs it. The Emeryville city council, which has endorsed Measure O, has done a good job with providing affordable housing but they have lagged on expensive livability issues the people have said they want like parks, bike infrastructure, etc. and the wealthy. That rate should not be earmarked for these things, it would take the pressure off more mundane spending requirements and presumably free up discussions about general fund discretionary spending in the future.

While we appreciate the graduated nature of this tax targeting wealthier property owners, we think the $1 million lower limit for collecting the tax makes it less effective. As government developers generally won’t build low-income housing without governmental involvement, the tax increase would be used to construct affordable housing and not be diverted to corporate profits for housing and low-income households. For details, see: https://vacancytax/berkeley.org/

We strongly recommend voting YES on M.
Oakland School Board, District 6

#1: Valarie Bachelor
#2: Joel Velasquez, with reservations

[Do NOT vote for Kyra Mungia]

District 6 in Oakland extends all the way from Skyline Boulevard down to Rt. 880. Again there are three candidates who we support and one whom we definitely oppose.

We support Valarie Bachelor as our No. 1 choice. She has lived in the Eastmont Hills for two years. She is an organizer for the California Federation of Teachers (CFT) and has been a labor organizer for 15 years. She has shown her public support for the Parker School liberation struggle and a moratorium on closures. She is the first choice of the Oakland Education Association (OEA) and is supported by the SPLA (Schools & Labor Against Privatization) coalition.

We rank Joel Velasquez No. 2. He is an Oakland parent and long time opponent of school closures in OUSD, going back 10 years to the occupation of Lakeview Elementary School. He has been visible as well around the recent campaign against closures, including Parker. He has provided leadership in school PTAs and on a citizens’ board. He applied for the opening on the District 6 board seat after Shannah Gonzalez was appointed to fill the seat. He is the No. 2 ranked candidate for the OEA and also backed by SPLA. Our concern with him is based on him not returning our questionnaire and the fact that he does not even have a campaign website.

We are very opposed to any support for the interim incumbent, Kyra Mungia. Though she taught briefly in Oakland (three years at Horace Mann), she was mainly selected to fill the District 6 opening because she serves as Mayor Libby Schaaf’s deputy director of education, working on programs around technology in the schools. Her links to the tech development sector and administration is enough to disqualify her, in our opinion.

Oakland School Board, District 4

#1: Pecolia Manigo
#2: Mike Hutchinson, with reservations

[No! No! No!, Do NOT vote for Nick Resnick]

The race around the Oakland School Board seat, District 4, is the most controversial of the three school races, not only around who we are supporting but whom we are strongly opposing here. District 4 boundaries have been redrawn but still include the affluent Montclair area, but also the Glenview, Laurel, and others. This has an obvious impact on this race, with Mike Hutchinson, currently on the school board for District 5, moved into District 4.

We are calling for voting for Pecolia Hudson-Manigo as our first choice. She is an Oakland parent and has served as executive director of PLAN, a parent advocacy group which had a long relationship with the teachers union, the OEA. She also spearheaded the Reformations for Black Students campaign against charters and closures, which included an attempt to halt the school closures. There were some questions over her complete rejection of charter schools, but her response satisfied the OEA Representative Council and leadership, which gave her a sole endorsement.

Mike Hutchinson decided to run in the new District 4 where he resides, though he would still have a year remaining as District 5 board member. He has been a long time opponent of closures and charters, but has generated much controversy around a range of issues, including non-payment of his staff, lack of focus involving the activists at his charter, and disregard in communications. There were some questions over her complete rejection of charter schools, but her response satisfied the OEA Representative Council and leadership, which gave her a sole endorsement.

Mike Hutchinson decided to run in the new District 4 where he resides, though he would still have a year remaining as District 5 board member. He has been a long time opponent of closures and charters, but has generated much controversy around a range of issues, including non-payment of his staff, lack of focus involving the activists at his charter, and disregard in communications.

The choice is obvious, not simply because her opponent [Nick Resnick] is the current pro-closure Board majority, or in managing organizations or institutions; nor does he usually elaborate on how those ideals can be achieved. In addition, Resnick doesn’t have any experience in government, or in managing or organizing for political purposes; nor does he have a campaign website or any endorsements, per his questionnaire responses. Nevertheless, because of his unequivocal opposition to the A’s stadium/Howard Terminal project, which will eliminate good-paying union jobs at the Port and require public subsidies, he is our second choice. We rank him #3, but without an endorsement due to his lack of experience and campaign deficiencies.

For this November’s election, we had a shortage of volunteers to work on analyzing and writing articles; if you’d like to see more info in these articles, please volunteer!

Oakland City Council, District 2

Nikki Fortunate Bas

Oakland’s District 2 includes San Antonio, neighborhood by Lake Merritt, and Chinatown. Nikki Fortunate Bas is the current District 2 City Council member who resides in Eastmont Hills. She is taking a leave of absence this year, but emerged third for the District 3 seat.

Her major work has focused on affordable housing and expanded mental health programs. As to the first, she helped lead the vote for an eviction moratorium during the pandemic. She has advocated for expansion of community land trusts, creation of community owned affordable housing, and programs to support the homeless. As to the second, she headed the task force on reimagining public safety, including a tripling of funds for public mental health services.

She has been a strong advocate for immigrant rights. She helped pass Measure T, the proposed progressive business tax, on the current ballot. Representing Chinatown, she has been outspoken on the potential impact of the Howard Terminal project and against the complete developer plan proposed by Oakland’s own John Fisher. While she may fall short of what some Greens hope for in a complete rejection of the project, she clearly opposes the proposed giveaway.

Ms. Bas has supported hazard pay for grocery workers and has a background in organizing garment workers in Chinatown. Thus, it is no surprise she has strong labor backing, including the Alameda Central Labor Council and its municipal unions (such as SEIU 1021). She has served as a director of the East Bay Alliance for a Sustainable Economy and has support from groups such as Rise Up. She has also been endorsed by East Bay E-Democracy.

Her only opponent, who entered the race very late, is Harold Lowe, a financial planner working for Frontier Wealth Strategies. Outside of chairing the oversight committee for Measure G, the earlier parcel measure to raise funds for Oakland schools, he seems to have no real public record.

The choice is obvious, not simply because her opponent seems of little consequence, but more importantly because she has provided leadership on some of the most critical issues Oakland is facing—affordable housing and reprioritization of funds for public safety. We call on all voters for Nikki Fortunate Bas for City Council, District 2.
Oakland City Council, District 4

Janani Ramachandran (preferred but not endorsed)

Oakland District 4 (with its new boundaries) includes affluent neighborhoods like Montclair and Redwood Heights and more middle/lower income areas such as Glenview, Laurel and Dimond. The seat is for six grabs (with Sheng Tao stepping down to run for mayor), but there are only two contestants: Janani Ramachandran and Nenna Joiner.

We know Janani from her 2021 special election race for District 18, State Assembly, when we supported her campaign. She has an impressive background, having served as a commissioner on the City of Oakland Public Ethics Commission, working for Central Legal de la Raza supporting immigrant workers, and being involved in family violence programs supporting survivors of abuse. Her program emphasizes affordable housing (including using publicly owned land), programs for the homeless (safe tiny housing, pathways to permanent housing, and comprehensive mental health), more programs for parks and public space, fire emergency services, and low crime (such as community policing and the MACRO program). Her opposition to the Howard Terminal stadium project had been a hallmark of her state assembly contest, but recently she has softened her stance, while maintaining a call for community benefits. Thus, her labor support includes not only the Labor Council and the municipal unions (SEIU 1021 and IFTPE) but most of the building trades. She is also backed by the Democratic liberal establishment, ranging from RO Khana to the Wellstone Club. She is also endorsed by ACCE, the Oakland Tenants Union, and Our Revolution.

Her only opponent, Nenna Joiner, has a curious background, operating a sex shop, Feelmore Adult Gallery. She was introduced by Mayor Libby Schaff to Joe Biden as one of Oakland’s “up-and-coming entrepreneurs.” While we agree in legalizing and protecting sex workers, MS Joiner, takes this concern to advocate for much stronger street safety, reducing the number even more like a 50% “safe order” candidate. There seems little else of substance in her program.

This is a non-partisan race, we cannot but help note Ramachandran’s involvement in the county’s Democratic Party’s campaign for the Bonta liberal Democratic Party establishment. In addition, her wavering on her stand around Howard Terminal is a clear retreat. Thus, despite her outstanding record and her advocacy on key progressive issues, we state our preference for her in this race, but not our endorsement.

Oakland City Council, District 6

Courtney Ruby

Four candidates will be on the ballot, contesting for the District 6 City Council seat; however, none of them is clearly better than the others, and we have concerns with each of them. Two filled out our questionnaire, Kenneth Sessions and Nancy Sidebotham. Sidebotham has been very involved in her local community and strongly opposes the A’s stadium/Howard Terminal project. However, she opposes a municipal ID card, is against raising the minimum wage, and she wants to increase the police force, so we can’t endorse her.

While Sessions did return our questionnaire, he did not answer many of the questions and did not indicate any background with government, elections, or politics, not even at the community or neighborhood level. He said he doesn’t have any endorsements and as we go to press, he hasn’t visited a candidate website. He wrote he’d need “tutoring on how to interpret the budget,” he wants to hire more police officers, and he’s opposed to extending the Just Cause law, but he lacks solid answers on how to tackle our City’s urgent needs. Yakupsa Zazaboi’s website has sections on Homelessness, Clean Neighborhoods, and Economic Growth & Development, but none of those sections have clear and specific ideas on how he’d address those issues, and most of the important issues we asked about in our questionnaire are not addressed at all.

Similarly, Kevin Jenkins’ website also doesn’t address most of the important issues in our questionnaire and it lacks workable, specific ideas for most of the four issues that are on his website. In addition, according to the City’s campaign finance page, Jenkins is the only candidate who has raised over $2,000 as of June 30 (the last reporting date available as we go to press).

However, his form 400 report shows that the significant majority of his money comes from OUTSIDE of Oakland — at least $20,350 of his $32,310 was from outside of the City and for donations of $200 or more (which make up over 87 percent of his $32,310 total), at least 72 percent was from outside of Oakland. So if you don’t like how Jenkins is financing his campaign, then rank all three of the other candidates in whatever order you prefer (or even randomly), since if a majority of voters do that, one of those other three will then become our next District 6 City Councilmember.

Oakland City Auditor

Courtney Ruby

Courtney Ruby is running for a fourth term as City Auditor. We appreciate that she responded to our questionnaire, despite having no opposition. She wrote, “It is an honor to be elected to hold Oakland’s government accountable and it is an honor to be the Auditor for the residents of Oakland.” Ruby and her team conduct audits to critically scrutinize the effectiveness, efficiency and compliance with the law of City programs, departments or operations. Follow-up audits are done to see if problems have been remedied.

During the past four years, Ruby’s audits have focused on some of the most critical issues facing our city government, such as homelessness, police reform, fire prevention, and government finance. Recent audit reports on homelessness services were welcomed by homeless people and advocates. Ruby also looks at the spending on development projects. For example, her audit of the Fox Theater project revealed the renovation cost of $91 million “had ballooned by $58 million without adequate oversight or accountability.” Ruby answered some of our questions about future development, including the A’s proposed project at Howard Terminal by saying: “I must be independent in fact and appearance regarding all issues that could potentially fall under the purview of the Auditor’s office.”

Ruby notes that the Office of the City Auditor is the independent watchdog over the other branches of City Government, but not the City Council. “It is a point of pride that the City Council appropriates funding for the City Auditor’s office,” she wrote. She explains that the number, risk, and complexity of mandated audits have stripped the capacity of the office. Measure X, the City’s Charter Amendment on the November ballot would establish a minimum staffing level. If passed, Measure X would provide additional oversight capacity that would help to resolve challenges the city is facing.

To those who may see City problems but are afraid to report them, Ruby emphasizes that the Auditor is obligated to fully protect whistleblowers.

The two candidates who did not return our questionnaire do have campaign websites, but both of those unfortunately lack solid answers on how to tackle our City’s urgent needs. Yakupsa Zazaboi’s website has sections on Homelessness, Clean Neighborhoods, and Economic Growth & Development, but none of those sections have clear and specific ideas on how he’d address those issues, and most of the important issues we asked about in our questionnaire are not addressed at all.

Oakland Measure H

Yes, with parcel tax reservations

Renewal of funding for schools

Measure H is another parcel tax measure to aid the Oakland schools. It is a continuation of a similar measure, passed over a decade ago. We supported the previous assessment, with our usual critique of parcel taxes. H is for a $120 per parcel tax for 14 years, with out increasing the initial tax rate, adding an annual cost of living adjustment, providing exemptions for seniors and special low income individuals, and having independent oversight and audits. Many Oakland schools already utilize and depend on the funds from the original measure.

Measure H is supported by the Oakland Education Association (the teacher’s union). Vote YES on measure H.

Oakland Measure Q

Yes, with bond reservations

Authorizes low rent social housing units

This measure results from a requirement established at the state level that 50% of the voters (60 percent+) to allow municipalities to float bonds for any housing expansion. This item, together with measure U, will provide $850 million as the first step to “develop, construct, or acquire, or assist the development of,” up to 13,000 low rent social housing units.

While we always assert our critique of bond offerings being generally regressive, we also make decisions based on necessity’s use. There are concerns that even with the state guidelines, for the extremely low and very low seeming “affordable” designations, the low criteria is at around $55,000 annual income for a one person household, with many excluded. Nonetheless, most any measure to build low rent housing is essential. It is also true that this money could be used to acquire already existing rental units for new housing. Again this should not prevent our support.

Measure Q is endorsed by East Bay DSA and local housing coalitions. In our research, the only opposition we found was from a conservative anti-tax group. Vote YES on measure Q.

Oakland Measure R - YES

Gender neutral language

Measure R is a clear YES. This measure will replace gender-specific language with gender-neutral language in the Oakland City Charter. We support this measure because the pronoun “he” to refer to the Mayor, the City Charter would use “the Mayor” or “they.” In essence, this measure replaces outdated language that was based on gender stereotypes. It also allows language to be inclusive of non-binary individual who do not identify as male or female. These changes are consistent with the Green Party’s platform of supporting the equality of all people, regardless of gender.

Oakland Measure S - YES

Voting for school board for non-citizen with children under 18

This is an obvious measure to support. It provides for access to voting for all parents/community non-citizens in Oakland school board elections. Many non citizen community activists are already heavily involved in Oakland school issues, such as the struggle against school closures. Federal law does not prohibit non-citizens from voting in state and local elections, but non-citizens are denied access to public education is a right, regardless of citizenship status.

Many towns and cities have proposed and even passed such progressive measures. At a time when voting rights and immigrant rights are under attack in many regions and states in the U.S., this is an obvious response, advocating reextension of democratic rights.

It is endorsed by a wide range of community groups such as Parent Voices Oakland and the East Bay Asian Youth Center. The negative argument is again provided by reactionaries of the local tax association. Vote YES on Measure S!
**City Measures: Oakland**

**Oakland Measure W**

*continued from page 1*

up to the special interest groups, corporations, and billionaires who represent a tiny and non-representative portion of the city, but who dominate political donations and who know that, by throwing in an obscene amount of money for oversized glossy full of misinformation, will have a statistically 77 percent chance of defeating Measure W. Allowing candidates to focus on what Oakland voters want, not what big money wants. Vote YES on the Oakland Fair Elections Act.

**Oakland Measure T**

Yes, with reservations

Progressive business tax

Measure T, the progressive business tax measure, is the product of the old “legislative sausage” process. This began with a much more progressive taxation campaign envisioned, the project being spearheaded by East Bay DSA as a grassroots, signature gathering effort. As it “progressed,” there were negotiations with the more liberal city council members (Fife, Bass, and Kaplan) attempting to prevent a major fight back from the Oakland business community and lessen the increased rates. Following this, a majority on the city council put it on the ballot; this had major backing from the Alameda Central Labor Council, especially from SEIU 1021 and IFTPE, (both are in negotiations with the city).

The result is still a progressive tax on larger businesses in the city (though the rates have been ratcheted down, hence our reservations), and by extension, it also provides relief for smaller businesses who currently pay a disproportionate amount in taxation.

The Chamber of Commerce has agreed not to oppose the measure, but it is not clear whether larger Oakland-based corporations, like Clorox, will follow suit. In addition, to unions, the measure is backed by a range of progressive groupings, including Oakland Rising and East Bay DSA.

**Oakland Measure U**

Yes, with bond reservations

Infrastructure Bond

This measure would allow the city to issue bonds of up to $850 million for affordable housing, street improvements, and updating of city facilities. Specifically, the measure estimates that $350 million would be allocated to construct, purchase and/or rehabilitate public housing; $290 million would be allocated to repave streets, build sidewalks and other infrastructure to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety; and $210 million to construct, improve and rehabilitate city facilities such as fire, police stations, and libraries.

Use of Measure U funds would be subject to an annual audit and oversight by the Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond Public Oversight Committee. In essence, Measure U is a continuation of the work started through Oakland’s 2016 Measure KK, another bond measure focused on housing, streets, and city facilities; through Measure KK, the city was able to construct, rehabilitate, or acquire and convert over 1,400 affordable housing units, and fulfill much of the city’s Three-Year Pavement Plan.

Given that Oakland is one of the most expensive housing markets in the country and the number of residents who are currently unhoused, further investment in affordable housing is urgently needed. Investments in repaving streets and infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists are also needed to create a safer environment that encourages use of active forms of transportation. Yet, as described in a report prepared by the city’s Director of Finance and presented to the council in July, the city currently lacks the funds to fully implement its plans to address these issues. Of course, we would rather see the city find another way to fund this work instead of issuing bonds (see page 2 for more about the Alameda Green Party’s concerns about bonds). However, there is no other funding mechanism being proposed, and investments in affordable housing, in particular, are urgently needed. As a result, we are recommending a Yes vote on Measure U.

**Oakland Measure V - YES**

Just Cause

For measure V, only an argument in favor was officially submitted, and we agree with that argument and have extracted several of its key points, as follows: Just Cause for eviction is the basic protection for tenants, meaning that, if a landlord wants to evict, they must show a valid reason. Under Just Cause's existing law, landlords cannot evict for an arbitrary reason, or no reason at all. Just Cause for Eviction is the best defense against discrimination, retaliation, harassment, and displacement. It makes it harder for landlords to evict merely because the tenant asked for repairs or if the landlord only wants to rent to tenants of a certain race. Of course, property owners can still move into their unit if they choose. Essentially, a landlord who wants to evict must state in writing their reasons, and the tenant has the right to dispute that in court.

Vote YES on Measure V.

**Oakland Measure X - YES**

Term Limits, etc.

This Measure makes numerous, largely minor changes to the City Charter that have the potential to modestly improve city governance and functioning. First, there are currently no term limits for councilmembers and this measure would set a limit of three consecutive terms. As noted in the measure, this change could create more opportunities for new candidates to run and be elected for open seats, since running against incumbents can otherwise be an insurmountable barrier.

Second, the measure would also eliminate a loophole that prevents the Mayor from casting a tie-breaking vote on the council. Currently, councilmembers who oppose a measure would otherwise receive a 4-4 vote in the council can simply abstain from voting to create a 4-3 vote, which kills the measure instead of allowing the Mayor to cast a vote to break the tie. Measure X would close this loophole by counting abstentions and absences as a “no” vote strictly for the purpose of determining whether the Mayor can cast a tie-breaking vote on a measure.

Third, the measure would require the city council to hold a minimum of two public hearings on proposed ballot measures relating to property taxes, bonds, or changes to the City Charter before they are placed on the ballot. This requirement would allow for more public input on the proposed text of ballot measures, which could help Oakland voters avoid having to vote on poorly written and/or deeply flawed measures. The measure also includes several changes relating to the City Auditor, including clarifying the duties of the position, setting minimum qualifications, prohibiting them from endorsing candidates for most city offices, and requiring the city to budget for at least 14 full-time staff in this office. It would also allow the Public Ethics Commission to investigate and adjudicate ethics complaints against the city auditor, and the city attorney, with the stated goal of making them competitive with similar positions within the city and across the region. There are several other minor changes that, while too numerous to note, seem logical. In all, this measure appears to be a positive step toward encouraging fresh faces to run for office, allowing for public input on proposed ballot measures, and improving processes for city governance.

**Oakland Measure Y - NO**

Zoo parcel tax

Measure Y is another money grab by the Conservation Society of California, a private non-profit that runs the Oakland Zoo. The measure would impose a $68 per year parcel tax on homeowners and other property owners in Oakland.

The measure would require an annual increase in the tax based on inflation. The Conservation Society, formerly the East Bay Zoological Society, has received tens of millions of dollars from the City since the last decades while managing the property in Knowland Park. In 2002 the City voters approved Measure G which gave the Society $23 million for an expansion that would increase their operating cost of $70 million. In 2012 the Conservation Society placed a measure on the Alameda County ballot that would have placed a parcel tax on every property in the City with median home values being $650,000. A parcel tax proposal to increase current household costs by $3 dollars did not have an annual cost of living increase, and the total amount of funds collected was less. And unlike Measure A, the current Measure Y will place the burden for maintaining a facility used by residents of the region only on Oakland residents. Measure A lost, but now the Society is back with an even bigger money grab. In 2020, the City council voted to approve $53 acres of Knowland Park property for the purpose of implementing a conservation easement for the benefit of local wildlife, specifically the Alameda whiptail snake which is a threatened species. The Easement was a requirement for the expansion of the Zoo footprint further into Knowland Park. Normally a developer would have to pay for such lands, but the Conservation Society paid nothing, except the promise to complete the implementation of the easement, along with funding the endowment to guarantee the costs of long-term management of the lands. The Conservation Society is now requesting a parcel tax to fund their expenses, but it still has not been completed. The Conservation Society has a history of not fulfilling its legal responsibilities, like its ongoing failure to provide accounting to the City for its use of City funds.

Add to all of this that the Zoo is confining wild animals in artificial habitats, that do little to help with the long-term conservation of species, and that most consistent actions they have taken—recently, as well as over the past decades.

In addition to officially being counted as valuing the corporate-free politics of peace, justice and ecology by registering Green, you will also help us maintain our status as a California ballot-qualified political party. To register online, go to https://registervote.ca.gov/. Postage-paid voter registration cards are available for free at most libraries and post offices.

Please remember to register Green as soon as you can, or at least by November 30!

**Register Green by November 30**

If you are not already a registered Green, or if you changed Party preference to vote in the Primary, please be sure to register Green! To remind yourself, resolve that you’ll register Green by no later than the end of the November. It’s important to let the corrupt Corporate Parties know that you don’t approve of their many policy failures and the unaccountable actions they have taken—recently, as well as over the past decades.

In addition to officially being counted as valuing the corporate-free politics of peace, justice and ecology by registering Green, you will also help us maintain our status as a California ballot-qualified political party.
**AC Transit, At-Large**

**Alfred Twu**

The AC Transit Board has two At-Large Directors who represent the many cities and various unincorporated areas in western Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. These seats are on the ballot in different years. This year we endorse the following: Alfred Twu, who has served on the Berkeley Planning Commission. In the At-Large race, only Twu returned our questionnaire.

As a former, in service, user and advocate of public transit, he has worked with organizations such as Seamless Bay Area, Walk/Bike Berkeley, and East Bay Transit Riders Union on illustrations, infographics, board games, and other efforts to educate residents about AC Transit. As an AC Transit Director, he has worked on transit facilities and transit-oriented affordable housing. He supports development of housing and workforce development relationships with community and elected leaders in cities, other transit agencies, and at the state-level. Twu is not taking corporate or political PAC money. He signed the No Fossil Fuel Money pledge.

Two points that public transit is at a crossroads, with the pandemic, climate change, and the shift in city planning to reflect less use of individual cars. In the next few years, we will see whether public transit can succeed, or will enter a downward spiral. One of Twu’s top priorities is to coordinate bus, BART, and bike services. Other priorities include continued expansion of AC Transit, more service on express buses, especially in neighborhoods with more air pollution, more service in low-income areas—where people are more likely to have no other transportation option and must get to work, for health reasons and to get food. Since AC Transit gets fewer per-passenger subsidies than rail and ferry, he supports free bus pass pilot programs and the new BayPass all-agency pass program. He does not mention the goal of reducing carbon emissions, but he states that AC Transit must be environmentally smart and smart about its budget. In an interview with the AC Transit union, Twu states, “AC Transit will need to think outside of the box to find new and sustainable sources of revenue to support the service we provide.”

In their questionnaire responses, Twu had more specific answers to several of the questions than any other candidate. For example, when asked in evaluating bus rapid transit (BRT), she wrote, “Tempo is a fantastic transit project that is bringing faster, more reliable service to the people who use it. Riders benefit from 5- to 10-minute headways throughout the day, but-only on off-bus fare payment, all-door boarding, and comfortable, canopied stations,” whereas Chen only noted that she’s “seen” the improvements, so she also needs further changes; I agree changes have been positive but we can do better.”

Similarly, Twu’s answers about AC Transit perhaps developing a zero-emission-emission fleet is also how they might accommodate the loss of parking at the Ashby and North Berkeley BART stations shows a much greater awareness of specific factors that impact these questions. By contrast, when we asked about emerging transport technologies, Syed responded that, “There is a lot we can do right now with the tools that we have while keeping an eye to the future. Rather than racing to be the first to deploy some new technology, we should instead focus on mundane mobility solutions that actually work. I think it is time for some cheap and boring transportation solutions,” and gave us examples of why “fixed route bus service is the most efficient way of providing transit service to most communities.”

Syed’s questionnaire answers show she is better qualified to serve, hence our preference for her, but due to a shortage of votes, we are unable to endorse her. For this race, we’re unfortunately not able to make a formal endorsement here. Please help us alleviate this shortage by volunteering!

**AC Transit, Ward 4**

**Ashland, Castro Valley, Cheryland, San Lorenzo and portions of Hayward and San Leandro**

**Barisha Spriggs**

We endorse Barisha Spriggs, a transit rider/advocate and community leader in Ward 4, where she has lived for more than 30 years. She is supported by Amalgamated Transit Union Local 192, which represents AC Transit bus operators, mechanics, and other workers. She is also endorsed by AC Transit Director Jovanka Beckles, elected in 2020. ATU endorsed Beckles then, as did Greens. For many months during the pandemic, ATU workers and allies fought for hazard pay back. ATU finally won “appreciation pay” and other gains in their new contract earlier this year.

In March 2022, Spriggs applied to fill a vacant Ward 4 seat on the AC Transit Board. After she was hired, she worked to ensure that the Board understood the role of the Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 192, Please vote for Barisha Spriggs for AC Transit, Ward 4.

**AC Transit, Ward 5**

**Fremont, Newark, Union City, parts of Hayward**

**Diane Shaw** (unopposed, not on the ballot)

Diane Shaw was first elected in 2018, and is now running for re-election. Greens endorse her. But because she was not opposed, this position is elected by a ballot of students of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the AC Transit Board. Spriggs catalyzed the $2 million Emergency Repave of Ashland and the $20 million Ashland East 14th Street Phase 2 Repave Improvement project. Spriggs also supported more fare-free waterloo services, for all AC Transit riders, especially those who stepped down. Now retired, McCally spent his entire 30+ year work life in public transit. He was employed at two transit agencies in Southern California, serving as CFO in both. He has been a boardwide consultant specializing in public transit finance.

McCALLY grew up in the East Bay in a family that did not own a car and only used AC Transit. He grew up in a blue collar/union household, and he can appreciate and respect the work of organized labor. Now he lives in Castro Valley, where the nearest AC Transit bus stop is a few miles away, so he drives to get to the closest public transit. He wants to represent Ward 4 because the community is underserved. He wrote, “AC Transit will need to think outside of the box in providing the transit services demanded,” such as “last minute bus service to get to work, to school, to doctors, and the Flex service, which had limited success. I would like AC Transit to reexamine its Flex service to see if it can be structured to work efficiently.”

Regarding the “normal” post covid AC Transit needs to adjust to new travel patterns and demand. McCALLY wrote, “Low, income transit dependent riders should be afforded a level of service that matches their demand. He supports low fares for elderly and low income people. What’s needed is “Funding, funding and more funding.” McCally is endorsed by AC Transit Board Members Esha Ortiz, Joel Young, and Christian Peoples; Alameda County Supervisor Nate Miley, San Leandro Councilmember Deborah Cox, Hayward Council Member Sara Lamnin, and the Sierra Club.

Spriggs’s endorsements were the deciding factor for us, especially that of the Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 192. Please vote for Barisha Spriggs for AC Transit, Ward 4.

**AC Transit, Ward 3**

**Sarah Syed** (preferred, but not endorsed)

Two candidates are on the ballot for the Ward 3 seat: Sarah Syed and Stewart Chen. We have a preference for Syed, but are not able to endorse because we were short-handed in having enough volunteers to adequately address this.

Syed has Master’s degrees in city planning and transportation engineering from UC-Berkeley. On her website she says she’s spent her career “building light rail and better bicycle facilities in the Bay Area at BART and in Silicon Valley. I led bus rapid transit planning in Los Angeles and...” and the “Othering and Belonging Institute at UC-Berkeley help communities have their voices heard in planning and evaluations of transportation programs.”

Chen is president of the Oakland Chinatown Improvement Council and was also appointed to the AC Transit Public Transportation Board in 2018. His church, which previously was elected to the City of Alameda Healthcare District and to the City Council.

In their questionnaire responses, Syed had more specific answers to several of the questions than any other candidate. For example, when asked in evaluating bus rapid transit (BRT), she wrote, “Tempo is a fantastic transit project that is bringing faster, more reliable service to the people who use it. Riders benefit from 5- to 10-minute headways throughout the day, but-only on off-bus fare payment, all-door boarding, and comfortable, canopied stations,” whereas Chen only noted that she’s “seen” the improvements, so she also needs further changes; I agree changes have been positive but we can do better.”

Similarly, Syed’s answers about AC Transit perhaps developing a zero-emission-emission fleet is also how they might accommodate the loss of parking at the Ashby and North Berkeley BART stations shows a much greater awareness of specific factors that impact these questions. By contrast, when we asked about emerging transport technologies, Syed responded that, “There is a lot we can do right now with the tools that we have while keeping an eye to the future. Rather than racing to be the first to deploy some new technology, we should instead focus on mundane mobility solutions that actually work. I think it is time for some cheap and boring transportation solutions,” and gave us examples of why “fixed route bus service is the most efficient way of providing transit service to most communities.”

Syed’s questionnaire answers show she is better qualified to serve, hence our preference for her, but due to a shortage of votes, we are unable to endorse her. For this race, we’re unfortunately not able to make a formal endorsement here. Please help us alleviate this shortage by volunteering!
BART, District 4

No endorsement
(Not on the ballot)

Robert Ruahm is running unopposed for BART Board District 4. He has a mixed history as an incumbent, and sent an email that he was too occupied with other duties to respond to our questionnaire. Ruahm’s actions on the BART Board were not well known to a campaign volunteer who won the other seats, so we’ll focus our write-up on the other Alameda County seat up for election—District 6.

BART, District 6

Lance Nishihira

Lance Nishihira: Of the three registered candidates for BART Board of Directors, District 6, Lance Nishihira has the longest list of professional qualifications, experience, and training, centered around progressive ideals that would prepare him for success on the BART Board. More importantly, his answers to our lengthy questionnaire, along with his substantial list of endorsements from colleagues on numerous boards also show a greater ability to work with others on challenging issues to move things forward. BART definitely has its challenging issues, and needs someone that can work with others to make needed progress. Based on the history of the candidates, their responses, what they’ve done, and who supports them, this is a pretty clear and easy decision to support Lance Nishihira for the BART Board.

Liz Ames first ran for the BART Board four years ago to fill an open seat. After serving one term, the majority of Board members with whom he/she endorsed gave his/her support. Nishihira, Anne Tatarzakan, the candidate we supported four years ago, endorses Ames’ opponent Lance Nishihira. Among local elected officials, the majority who have endorsed in this race support Ames’ opponent Lance Nishihira.

Ames campaigns for change, but takes credit for or lists campaign priorities projects that BART has had in the works before Ames was elected. Other stated campaign priorities haven’t changed from her original campaign four years ago. We wrote four years ago that such vague campaign pledges came across as platitudes—easy comments to make when running for office, but with no real plan on how to make them happen. We see a major contradiction between Ames’ main pledge to hold costs down, while promoting more resources for a long list of things that riders/voters would like, but especially emphasizing more resources for police and security. We would all like things to be better on BART; it’s easy to come up with lists of things we would like to see improved. It’s harder to come up with real solutions. As stated, the majority of improved security measures that Ames calls for have been in the works and in development since before Ames was elected. Ironically, Ames pledges accountability, fiscal responsibility, and to keep personnel costs down, but also pledges increased resources mainly for police. It’s not clear how she intends to do this. She also mentions increasing police, as well as Services. Her vague promises did give her the endorsement of the head of the police union—not the most progressive voice for change or fiscal accountability. The more progressive vote for real change is for her opponent, Lance Nishihira.

Shyam Chetan returned the questionnaire, but his responses, while friendly, were extremely limited, and don’t reflect much thought about the issues.

EBMUD (East Bay Municipal Utilities District) Ward 3

Marguerite Young

Ward 4: Andy Katz
(unopposed, not on the ballot)

Ward 7: Matt Turner

East Bay MUD, as it is fondly called (or EBMUD for short), is governed by a seven-member board of directors, elected by wards. In addition to providing water service to over two million customers in the Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, EBMUD provides wastewater treatment to parts of Northern Alameda and Western Contra Costa County through its “Special District 1” or “SD1” for short) governed by the same board of directors.

This Ward, 2016 Central Contra Costa County, 3 (parts of Alameda and Contra Costa Counties), 4 (parts of western Alameda and Contra Costa Counties), and 7 (mostly southern areas of Alameda County—and a bit of San Ramon) are up for election. (See: https://www.ebud.com/about-us/board-directors/your-board-members-for-map.)

Two seats in Ward 7 are uncontested and won’t be on the ballot: Ward 7 (John Coleman) and Ward 4 (Andy Katz). A third incumbent, Frank Mellon, has not sought reelection, so that seat is open.

The Issues

Water supply is a perennial issue for EBMUD. While supply is now adequate, climate change is creating problems by decreasing snowpack in the Sierra, where most of EBMUD’s water comes from. That means more water will arrive sooner— as rain. Also, if Bay Area population continues to expand (as the State is predicting) more water may be needed. How future water supply is addressed— both for storage and for flood control—is a long-term issue that’s likely to be expensive and contentious. It could mean more sharing with other districts, more groundwater storage shared with Central Valley farmers (“conjunctive use”), or expanded surface water storage in reservoirs.

The flip-sides of water supply are water conservation and recycled water use. Both would reduce the need for added supply. EBMUD has been a leader in both, but they can get expensive and, if recycled drinking water is involved, controversial.

Sea level rise is another looming climate change issue. Most of SD1’s facilities are along the Bay shoreline and will be increasingly subject to flooding. Whether to protect or move these facilities will be a major issue.

Finally, disaster preparedness is a biggie for EBMUD. Earthquakes can certainly threaten local reservoirs and could start in EBMUD’s extensive forested watershed areas. Preparedness costs money, but may prevent even bigger losses.

The Races

Ward 3: Marguerite Young (incumbent) vs. Mark Seel-all/Marguerite Young is seeking her third 4-year term. She has run as a pro-environment candidate and is endorsed by the Sierra Club and East Bay League of Conservation Voters as well as by major labor unions, local elected officials, and fellow EBMUD directors. In her questionnaire response she emphasizes her support for protecting the Mokulumne River (EBMUD’s main water supply) as a wild and scenic river. She also points to an increased rate of replacing old pipelines, expanding EBMUD’s customer assistance to low-income households, promoting anti-racist policies, and having EBMUD become carbon-neutral by 2030.

On water supply, she supports continuing to expand EBMUD’s water conservation and recycling programs, as well as its conjunctive use and interties with other water suppliers. She feels EBMUD does well managing its water resources, wildfire habitation, and fire protection. On SD1, she would like to continue improving the system’s efficiency and protecting its facilities from sea level rise.

Mark Seel-all, known as the “water system planner” is making his first run for this board seat. His questionnaire responses emphasize wanting to increase the rate of pipeline replacement while keeping rate increases below the inflation rate. He opposes installing “smart meters,” like those used by PG&E, because meter readers provide on the ground, “eyes on the street.”

Ward 4: Andy Katz (incumbent) unopposed: While Mr. Katz will not be on the ballot, he did provide a questionnaire response, which was both responsive and well thought out. He emphasizes his support for EBMUD’s customer assistance to low-income households, anti-racist policies, and improved fire protection. He also emphasizes his support for addressing climate change. However his answers to our lengthy questionnaire, along with his substantial list of endorsements from colleagues on numerous boards also show a greater ability to work with others on challenging issues to move things forward. BART definitely has its challenging issues, and needs someone that can work with others to make needed progress. Based on the history of the candidates, their responses, what they’ve done, and who supports them, this is a pretty clear and easy decision to support Lance Nishihira for the BART Board.
Prop 26 - No Position

Legalizes sports betting at Indian casinos & racetracks

Prop 27 - NO

Legalizes online and mobile sports betting

Both of these propositions would greatly expand gambling in California. Prop 26 would do so on Indian lands plus at existing horse racing tracks, while 27 would do this via online gambling anywhere in the state.

These two Propositions address somewhat related and feed off each other; both are motivated by the opportunity to make large amounts of money, as evidenced by the most money ever raised during a single election state proposition issue—over $360 million thus far, from the various gaming interests involved.

Proposition 27 - No Position

Legalizes sports betting at Indian casinos & racetracks

Proposition 26

Legalizes online and mobile sports betting

Prop 26 is motivated to run so she may push for some changes to current EBRPD Board practices and policies. She wants to change the District’s “current inhumane policy of exterminating feral cats that live on park grounds, and make East Bay Regional Park District’s policy-making process more transparent and more efficient.”

On tension between various types of trail uses she observed “while the population continues to grow, trails and access to the parks have not. For example, with 73 parks and over 1,000,000 acres of open space, there is not a single bike-specific trail built in the entire district. I propose making the parks safer and more accessible by building separate bike-specific trails to prevent collisions with hikers, and allowing pedal-assist e-bikes so physically-challenged persons can enjoy riding in the parks.” Lin believes the District’s main purpose is to “preserve open lands against urban development, and provide venue for the public to enjoy nature and the outdoors.” In doing so, the District “should focus more on the stewardship of existing land holdings because it does not properly manage its existing land holdings, which it can justifiably acquire and price which often is being cheap grazing grounds for cattle ranchers.” See her questionnaire for her responses on other policy areas.

Gina Lewis began her community service as an ap- pointee to the Union Pacific & Recreation Commission. Later that same year, she was appointed to the Executive Board of Directors for the California Association of Park and Recreation Commissioners and Board Members, a state-wide citizen organization. She has been a member of the Kitayama Elementary School Site Council and District Council in New Haven Unified School District in Union City.

Despite multiple emails and phone calls, Lewis did not return our questionnaire so what little we can learn about her approach to serving on the EBRPD Board is taken from her website. “Representative access to the 88-year-old District, the district has never been a Black woman appointed or elected as a Director. Issues that affect us never make it to the table for discussion.” She calls for “more sustainable ‘best practices’” and greater “trans- parency in our dealings especially with employees.” Un- fortunately, we do not have any information about Lewis’s policy positions or specific practices and procedures she might raise with the Board if elected.

Our recommendation is to vote for either Daphne Lin or Gina Lewis. Unfortunately, we do not have information about both candidates. We like Lin’s clear statement that District policy should be to not exterminate feral cats, since that is indeed the District’s goal; and her willingness to bring new perspectives to harmonizing various trail-use types and other topics. On the other hand, her lack of experience in dealing with land management and wildlife issues may be a weakness until she gets up to speed. Waespi clearly has some know-how when it comes to navigating the regional political arena and connections with stakeholders, but at the same time his longevity may make him less willing to take a radical approach to solving important long-standing problems in District lands. Unfortunately, Gina Lewis did not provide enough background for us to recommend her.

East Bay Regional Park District, Ward 3

Unfortunately, not on the ballot

Olivia Sanwong is the only candidate that filed to run for the seat. Sanwong was recently re-elected to the Zone 7 Water Agency Board of Directors in the June primary, in part running on her experience with EBRPD as a member of the Park Advisory Committee start- ing in 2016. Sanwong did not return our questionnaire, but a press release she highlighted her campaign mission to “balance access to recreation activities with environmental stewardship and responsible financial management while also planning for extreme weather events.”

Unfortunately, Alameda County does not print uncontested races for special districts on the ballot. Therefore, someone who was never elected to a particular office can be seated to it without the voters first having a chance to weigh in on it. It would be better if the race appeared on the ballot so that the candidate could at least run against the write-in vote rather than automatically taking office without a single voter approving of them filling that seat. At a minimum, voters would have an opportunity to see that a seat is being filled, and even perhaps to realize that they themselves could have filed to run for the seat!

In any case, this is the current state of (or lack of) democracy in Alameda County.
Proposition 27 - NO
Proposition 27 was put on the ballot by deceptive propagandists. Signers were told by paid signature collectors that “this new measure will raise money to end homelessness in California.” Proposition 27 was not initiated, nor promoted by California Indian tribes, but by out-of-state corporations that sought to take advantage of the voters’ universal desire to end homelessness and the compassion of state voters to lift up the plight of California’s native peoples from the viscosity of poverty.

The Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988 correctly acknowledged the sovereignty of Indigenous people and the right of tribes to operate gambling casinos on tribal land. This proposal would deny all tribes, both Indian and non-Indian, the right to play the popular casino games that millions of Americans enjoy both in casinos and on mobile devices. The measure blatantly lies in many ways:

• that revenue from online gaming will uplift poorer non-casino Indian tribes. Implicit analysis shows that at least 90 percent of revenue from the expansion will go into the pockets of the out-of-state casino operators that wrote the measure specifically for their benefit.

• that revenue from the measure will end homelessness. Besides there being no revenue to allocate, voters need only to recall that the “selling point” years ago for approving the State Lottery was the promise that produced revenue “would forever end the problem of funding education throughout the state”;

• that minorities will not be able to gamble online. No procedures are indicated that will weed out anyone with a digital device from online access.

Additionally, because those of lower income and wealth are likely to lose in larger measure to games of chance with the hope of improving their status, Proposition 27 would aggravate economic inequality. The availability of unlimited online gaming opportunities will provide increased attractions that will further worsen the already weak financial condition of marginalized people.

The great majority of California Indian Council tribes oppose Proposition 27 as a “bogus pledge that will proliferate gambling throughout California life and institutions, degrading lifestyles of minors as well as the elderly, by which the tribe opposes Proposition 27 as a boondoggle that will proliferate gambling with 51 billion annually for art and music programs in K-12 schools, statewide (regrettably including charters, which is now built into the state program) with a goal of enriching resources.

The resources come from the general fund, over and above the state constitutional requirements for K-12 funding as is required by Prop. 98. Thus the main teachers’ union, the California Teachers Association, and its president, Toby Boyd, are supporting the proposition, since it doesn’t lessen Prop. 98 monies. There have been ongoing efforts for a good number of years to strengthen the arts, even while Proposition 27 would undermine arts and enrichment programs, especially in poorer districts, with large working class and people of color student populations. In the past, there were categorical monies that were targeted at needed goals, but these were ended in the 1990s.

Opposition arguments were submitted against Prop. 28. This is a worthwhile proposition, especially with the state having an over $90 billion surplus. Vote “Yes” on Prop. 28.

Proposition 29 - YES
On-site medical professional at kidney dialysis clinics

An overwhelming Yes to Proposition 29! Kidney dialysis is a life-saving procedure. Who among us would not want our families, loved ones, and friends to be in the care of a trained professional?

There are 80,000 kidney dialysis patients in California. Yet only two multi-national kidney dialysis corporations dominate the outpatient kidney dialysis industry in this state. Together, they treat more than 75 percent of all patients in the state and earn close to $250 million dollars a year in California. DeVita & Fresenius own and operate 72 percent of the clinics in the state. Dialysis patients were steered to commercial insurers by The American Kidney Fund which receives more than 80 percent of its revenue from Devita & Fresenius. Joint ventures between for-profit corporations and “physicians who own a stake and may also be the patient’s primary doctor” might pose a conflict of interest. The patient and/or their advocate will make better decisions when the problem of funding education throughout the state;

Proposition 29 protects the rights of the patient. Clinics will not be able to use government services to patients based on the source of payment. Proposition 29 prevents the closing of clinics or substantially reducing service there with state approval. All we know that corporations have closed stores, and fired employees, for wanting safe working conditions, a living wage, or unionization, but this is all to protect their profits. People deserve safe working conditions and they dialysis patients deserve the best health care possible. They deserve to have a licensed health professional in every dialysis outpatient clinic.

Americans pay more for health care than any other civilized nation and rank 40th in the quality of health of our people. Wake up California! Vote Yes for Proposition 29.

Proposition 30 – NO
Programs to reduce air pollution and prevent wildfires

At first glance this initiative might appear to be something that the Green Party would fully support. We are in the age of consequences of the global climate crisis and there is no time to waste to rapidly make a truly just transition to a clean energy economy. Going where the money is to fund clean energy initiatives is a policy priority for the Green Party. Prop 30 is expected to generate approximately $100 billion over 20 years. The money raised is divided into three main categories: 35 percent to ZEV infrastructure investment, 45 percent for ZEV and clean mobility, and 20 percent to the wildfire greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction.

Prop 30 emphasizes support for the adoption of cleaner products, and what it doesn’t include, which is very important to the Green Party over other forms of transportation such as active mobility and public transit. Prop 30 is aimed at making electric vehicles more affordable and charging infrastructure more ubiquitous. This has the likely impact of not just underfunding public transit, but in fact undercutting public transit. Transitioning cars to ZEV for those who insist on or need a personal car may be needed, but it is a misuse of a funding opportunity like this, and if Prop 30 passes as it is, it is highly unlikely that there will be another bite at the apple.

It is correct to identify wildfires as an enormous contributor to the state’s greenhouse gas emission profile, and a category that is currently not being counted. The issue needs to be addressed. But in this initiative, it simply pitches around $20 billion over 20 years to an agency that is woefully mismanaging California’s forests by selling trees to the logging industry in the guise of forest “thinning” for supposed wildfire prevention purposes. No funds need to be protected, and that should not be the role of CalFire.

CalFire’s role is to put out fires. Calls for a CalFire ‘divorce’ — splitting off the role of forest protection to a new agency — may be something the Green Party should support, but we shouldn’t be supporting handing them $20 billion.

Californians are desperately in need of improved and expanded clean electric mobility, and active mobility, biking amenities, and other non-car mobility options. For the reasons outlined above, we urge your “NO” vote on Prop 30.

Proposition 31 - YES
Approves the ban on certain flavored tobacco products

Over the last few years, tobacco corporations have evaded the ban on selling tobacco products to minors by selling flavored preparations that they calculate are so attractive to children that they will find ways to obtain them, and become addicted for life to nicotine. In 2020, the California Legislature adopted SB 793, that banned the sale of most flavored tobacco products, but the ban was evaded almost entirely by adults, like expensive flavored cigars. As the sponsor said, “Using candy, fruit, and other alluring flavors to entice kids to choose tobacco products is a strategy to beguile a new generation into tobacco addiction.” The bill was so popular with the public that only one legislator voted against it.

But the tobacco corporations, knowing the public supported the ban, nevertheless found a way to delay its implementation. Under California law, if a referendum against a law qualifies for the ballot, the law cannot be implemented until the voters make their decision. So they paid professional signature-gatherers millions of dollars to get enough signatures to delay the law until the election of November 2022. (How did they get the signatures? They lied. The signature-gatherers told voters that their signatures would qualify for the ballot a law that would ban selling flavored tobacco products! And the disclosure form they implemented until the voters make their decision. So they lied. The signature-gatherers told voters that their signatures would qualify for the ballot a law that would ban selling flavored tobacco products! And the disclosure form they appended to their campaign was that Prop 30 needs and polluters now that the delay is over. The California Legislature adopted SB 793, that banned the sale of most flavored tobacco products, but the ban was evaded almost entirely by adults, like expensive flavored cigars. As the sponsor said, “Using candy, fruit, and other alluring flavors to entice kids to choose tobacco products is a strategy to beguile a new generation into tobacco addiction.” The bill was so popular with the public that only one legislator voted against it.

But the tobacco corporations, knowing the public supported the ban, nevertheless found a way to delay its implementation. Under California law, if a referendum against a law qualifies for the ballot, the law cannot be implemented until the voters make their decision. So they paid professional signature-gatherers millions of dollars to get enough signatures to delay the law until the election of November 2022. (How did they get the signatures? They lied. The signature-gatherers told voters that their signatures would qualify for the ballot a law that would ban selling flavored tobacco products! And the disclosure form they appended to their campaign was that Prop 30 needs and polluters now that the delay is over. The California Legislature adopted SB 793, that banned the sale of most flavored tobacco products, but the ban was evaded almost entirely by adults, like expensive flavored cigars. As the sponsor said, “Using candy, fruit, and other alluring flavors to entice kids to choose tobacco products is a strategy to beguile a new generation into tobacco addiction.” The bill was so popular with the public that only one legislator voted against it.

But the tobacco corporations, knowing the public supported the ban, nevertheless found a way to delay its implementation. Under California law, if a referendum against a law qualifies for the ballot, the law cannot be implemented until the voters make their decision. So they paid professional signature-gatherers millions of dollars to get enough signatures to delay the law until the election of November 2022. (How did they get the signatures? They lied. The signature-gatherers told voters that their signatures would qualify for the ballot a law that would ban selling flavored tobacco products! And the disclosure form they appended to their campaign was that Prop 30 needs and polluters now that the delay is over. The California Legislature adopted SB 793, that banned the sale of most flavored tobacco products, but the ban was evaded almost entirely by adults, like expensive flavored cigars. As the sponsor said, “Using candy, fruit, and other alluring flavors to entice kids to choose tobacco products is a strategy to beguile a new generation into tobacco addiction.” The bill was so popular with the public that only one legislator voted against it.

But the tobacco corporations, knowing the public supported the ban, nevertheless found a way to delay its implementation. Under California law, if a referendum against a law qualifies for the ballot, the law cannot be implemented until the voters make their decision. So they paid professional signature-gatherers millions of dollars to get enough signatures to delay the law until the election of November 2022. (How did they get the signatures? They lied. The signature-gatherers told voters that their signatures would qualify for the ballot a law that would ban selling flavored tobacco products! And the disclosure form they appended to their campaign was that Prop 30 needs and polluters now that the delay is over. The California Legislature adopted SB 793, that banned the sale of most flavored tobacco products, but the ban was evaded almost entirely by adults, like expensive flavored cigars. As the sponsor said, “Using candy, fruit, and other alluring flavors to entice kids to choose tobacco products is a strategy to beguile a new generation into tobacco addiction.” The bill was so popular with the public that only one legislator voted against it.

But the tobacco corporations, knowing the public supported the ban, nevertheless found a way to delay its implementation. Under California law, if a referendum against a law qualifies for the ballot, the law cannot be implemented until the voters make their decision. So they paid professional signature-gatherers millions of dollars to get enough signatures to delay the law until the election of November 2022. (How did they get the signatures? They lied. The signature-gatherers told voters that their signatures would qualify for the ballot a law that would ban selling flavored tobacco products! And the disclosure form they appended to their campaign was that Prop 30 needs and polluters now that the delay is over. The California Legislature adopted SB 793, that banned the sale of most flavored tobacco products, but the ban was evaded almost entirely by adults, like expensive flavored cigars. As the sponsor said, “Using candy, fruit, and other alluring flavors to entice kids to choose tobacco products is a strategy to beguile a new generation into tobacco addiction.” The bill was so popular with the public that only one legislator voted against it.
Local Measures

Y - Oakland zoo parcel tax - No
City Auditor - Courtney Ruby

X - Oakland Term Limits, etc. - Yes (ranked, but not endorsed), #3: John Reimann (ranked, but not endorsed)
Election Day: November 8, 2022

W - Oakland Campaign Reform - Yes

O - Emeryville Real Property Transfer Tax Increase - Yes, with reservations

Q - Oakland: authorizes low rent social housing units - Yes, with bond reservations

P - Berkeley: authorizes low rent social housing units - Yes, with reservations

M - Berkeley Vacancy Tax - Yes

R - Berkeley: authorizes low rent social housing units - Yes, with bond reservations

S - Oakland non-citizen school board voting - Yes

T - Oakland Progressive Business Tax - Yes, with reservations

D - Countywide maximum floor area ratio increase for agricultural buildings - No, No, No!

C - Countywide maximum floor area ratio increase for commercial buildings - No, No, No!

Current Officeholders

Aaron Peskin - Supervisor, District 1
Bill Weir - Supervisor, District 2
Brenda Lee - Supervisor, District 3
Marie Bostwick - Supervisor, District 4

 jurisdictions including Berkeley, Oakland, Emeryville, and Alameda County.

for the thinking voter
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