

Green Voter Guide

A publication of the Green Party of Alameda County,
an affiliate of the Green Party of California.

Index

Statewide Offices	1, 15
State Assembly, Federal Offices.....	15
State Propositions	1, 14, 15
Judicial Offices.....	11
Special Districts	1, 12, 13
County Offices and Measures	11
City Offices and Measures	
Alameda	1, 3
Albany	3, 4
Berkeley	1, 4, 5, 6
Emeryville	7
Oakland	1, 8, 9, 10
Voter Card	Back page

Boycott the Statewide *Partisan* Races to Protest Prop 14's Effects

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

Given this shameful situation, we thought much about what our position should be regarding the partisan races for the November election. We recommend that people **BOYCOTT** the statewide partisan contests in the November election. (Specifically, the following 7 statewide offices: Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, and Insurance Commissioner.) And also most of the other partisan offices: U.S. Congress, State Senate, State Assembly (unless you decide to vote in the District 15 contest - see writeup), and State Board

of Equalization. Please also note that specific information about the candidates running in these races was provided in our June primary Voter Guide, which is available on the internet, at: <http://acgreens.wordpress.com/voter-guides/>.

Boycotting the statewide partisan races is not much of a sacrifice, since only candidates of the two major wings of the money party will be on the ballot. We hope that a visible drop in the vote totals in these races will make a statement against Prop. 14. In addition, California, as the Green Party has done for many years, also needs to start looking at proven alternatives to the failing electoral system we currently have. For example, most of western Europe uses the "proportional representation" election system with great success, and with high voter turnout that often exceeds 80 percent. (For more details, please see: <http://www.fairvote.org/reforms/fair-representation-voting/>).

We do want to be absolutely clear that we are **NOT** asking people not to vote at all. There are important ballot measures and worthwhile local non-partisan candidates that are worth supporting. So please **DO VOTE**—but with the *exception* of the above-listed *partisan* races!

Oakland Measure FF Yes, Yes, Yes! Minimum Wage Increase

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

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

We understand that \$12.25 is not a living wage in Oakland. Some people who are "Fighting for \$15" per hour are concerned that Measure FF will undercut that struggle. We don't agree. A victory for Measure FF will move the struggle for \$15 per hour forward. We support the struggle for \$15 per hour regardless of whether Measure FF wins or loses. Please vote YES for measure FF.

Alameda Mayor Trish Spencer

It's time to elect a new mayor. This spring more than 6,000 Alamedans signed a petition opposing the sale of Crab Cove to a developer when it was understood that this piece of land was to be purchased and developed by East Bay Regional Parks. The mayor and council went along with this bad plan and that's what mobilized the community to engage in a petition campaign and do for the city what the mayor and city council didn't. Two years ago we had a similar problem with a local developer who tried to swap a public golf course for a not equal piece of land without any objections to this by Mayor Gilmore. Mrs. Spencer objected to this and joined the campaign to save this parkland which triumphed in the end.

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

continued on page 3

Berkeley Measure R - YES Green Downtown and Public Commons Initiative

The Green Downtown Initiative is the latest chapter in the land use battle between big developers and the rest of us. In 2010, Berkeley voters approved a different Measure R, which asked voters to adopt a "Green Vision" for the downtown, ostensibly to meet the City's climate action goals. The measure said little and promised voters that in exchange for a few tall buildings, Berkeley would become one of the greenest cities in the United States. We called it greenwashing, and we were right. The City Council left huge loopholes in the 2010 zoning that allow projects to go forward with a bare minimum of the community, labor and environmental benefits promised. It also established an alternative, elective permitting process called "the Green Pathway" which allows any development under 75ft to go forward by right—no hearings, no public input, no appeals—ever. That alternative permitting path also truncates the Landmarks Preservation review process in force city-wide, making it easier for projects that potentially endanger historic resources to be approved (with no public input, hearings or possible appeals!).

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

continued on page 4

** GO PAPERLESS **

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

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

Thanks everyone!

STATE PROPOSITIONS Proposition 1 - NO Water Bond

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

As Kathryn Phillips, Director of Sierra Club California, said in a *Sacramento Bee* article on August 19, 2014, "The new bond, like the one it replaced, is written to enable extraordinarily expensive dams that will provide negligible benefit to the public, won't resolve our water supply problems and will irreparably damage the environment. It was written this way because the Legislature's Republicans and San Joaquin Valley Democrats threatened to withhold votes needed to get the bond bill passed unless they got money for the dams."

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

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

The last-minute decision to place this measure on No-
continued on page 14

EBMUD, Ward 3 Marguerite Young

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

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

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

continued on page 12



The Green Party of Alameda County

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

Your Green Party

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

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

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

The Green Party County Council meets in the evening on the 2nd Sunday each month at 6:45pm. This is the regular "business" meeting of the Alameda 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:

GreenPartyofAlamedaCounty-subscribe@yahoogroups.com

(all one word, no spaces, but a dash between County-subscribe). To get occasional announcements about current Green Party of Alameda County activities send an email to: announcementsGPAC-subscribe@yahoogroups.com.

Locals:

Alameda County Green Sundays: 2nd Sundays, at 5 pm (followed by a 6:45 pm County Council business meeting); Niebyl-Proctor Library, 6501 Telegraph Ave. at 65th St., Oakland. <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/AnnouncementsGPAC>. (510) 644-2293

Albany and Berkeley Greens: We are working on a number of November candidate and ballot measure contests. To join our email list, and for more information, contact: <http://lists.riseup.net/www/info/berkeleygreens>; (510) 644-2293

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

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

Credits:

Our voter guide team includes: Peter Allen, David Arkin, Jan Arnold, Bill Balderston, Dave Blake, Paul Burton (page layout), Harry Chomsky, Maxine Daniel, Brian Donahue, Chris Finn, Jim Harris, Dave Heller, Barry Hermanson, Greg Jan, Torger Johnson, Ralph Kanz, Tina Kimmel, Gretchen Lipow, Don Macleay, Bob Marsh, Patti Marsh, Kevin Reilly, Wilson Riles, Michael Rubin, Anthony Sanchez, John Selawsky, Chuck Siegel, Phoebe Sorgen, Kent Sparling, Lisa Stephens, Joan Strasser, Lindsay Vurek, and Nan Wishner.

Voter Guide Contributions

We would like to thank the campaigns, businesses, and individuals whose donations allowed us to produce this voter guide. For the candidates and campaigns, please be assured that we conducted our endorsement process first. No candidates or measures were invited to contribute to the funding of this publication if they had not already been endorsed. At no time was there a discussion of the likelihood of a candidate's financial support during the endorsement process. The Green Party County Council voted not to accept contributions from for-profit corporations. If you have questions about our funding process, call us at (510) 644-2293.

Enjoy politics? Missing 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 don't have analysis from local groups in those areas. 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 not 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>

Our endorsement process

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

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

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

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

Taxes, Bonds, Fiscal Responsibility and the Green Party

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

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

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

Prop 13 flattened property taxes and prohibited imposition of any new "ad valorem" (according to value) taxes on real property. Prop 13 also requires a 2/3 vote of the legislature to increase state taxes. This super-majority is a steep hurdle to jump, especially when slightly more than

1/3 of our legislators have pledged to vote against any and all taxes.

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

Bonds have been sold to voters as "no new taxes" rather than "spend now and make kids pay later, with interest." Bonds meanwhile enrich and give tax breaks to wealthy investors, and encourage scams by casino capitalists on Wall Street. Super-rich individuals and corporations avoid paying taxes, and instead loan money to the government in the form of bonds, and get even richer from the interest. Implementing a publicly-owned State Bank is one way California could use its own capital to fund public projects, and invest the interest savings back into California.

Property taxes before Prop 13 came primarily from commercial properties, and now primarily from homes. Homes are reassessed upon sale, whereas tax loopholes allow corporate properties to escape reassessment.

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

Sales taxes have been relied upon for balancing budgets, and weigh heavily given that, as updated annually by the California Budget Project, when looking at family income, the poorest 20 percent pay more of their income in state and local taxes than the richest 1 percent. This continues to be the case even after Proposition 30's tax rate increases. Those who average \$13,000 pay 10.6 percent and those who average \$1.6 million pay 8.8 percent.

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

Green Party of Alameda County

2022 Blake Street, Suite A, Berkeley, CA 94704-2604

(510) 644-2293 • www.acgreens.wordpress.com



Name: _____

Phone (h): _____ Phone (w): _____

Address: _____

City/ZIP: _____

email address: _____

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

Credit card #: _____ Exp: _____

Signature: _____ 3-digit code on back of card: _____

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

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

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

State law requires that we report contributor's:

Occupation: _____ Employer: _____

Thanks for your contribution of:

\$1 \$5 \$10 \$25 \$50 \$100 \$500 \$1,000 \$ _____

Support Your Green Party

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

In addition, our mailing and printing costs have significantly increased since our last Fall issue, for the November, 2012 election. Please send in the coupon to the left with your donation today!

Please clip the form to the left and mail it today to help your Green Party grow.

City of Alameda

Alameda Mayor

continued from page 1

She was involved in the petition campaign to save Crab Cove and expressed serious objections to the back-door land swap deal recently made by the Alameda Unified School district with the city, without an appraisal. Presently the city is creating close to 2,000 new housing units without a clear plan for mitigating traffic. With Alameda's limitations of four draw bridges and a tube with questionable standards to withstand the "big" one (quake) not to mention that 70 percent of the island commutes daily off the island a traffic plan is absolutely crucial. Mrs. Spencer is very well aware of this need and willing to focus on solutions.

Mrs. Spencer is close to the community and easily accessible; she answers her cell when called. She's been involved in her children's schools throughout as well as the PTA and PTA Council. We need a new voice in city hall that speaks for the community and not for the developers. Alameda is undergoing a rapid change in building and demographics as well a serious budget deficits. Mrs. Spencer's comprehensive bio shows a depth of thought while our sitting mayor didn't even bother to respond to the Green Party questionnaire (see: <http://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires/>). VOTE FOR TRISH SPENCER.

Alameda City Council Frank Matarrese

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

rational budgetary plan for the city.

Matarrese's stands out against the other candidates not just for his past experience but because he recognizes Alameda's geographical limitations as an island community bordered by San Francisco Bay with a limited transportation system. Matarrese expresses some very practical solutions such as city hybrid vehicles, expansion of AC Transit bus services and working with Oakland Chinatown on shared traffic problems. Matarrese's positions on environment, the budget and transportation make him clearly a Green Party choice. He has received the endorsement of the Sierra Club. Vote Frank Matarrese for Alameda City Council.

We leave it to our readers to choose between the remaining two candidates, Jim Oddie and Stewart Chen. They each bring something to the table. While Chen now claims to support Crab Cove parkland, he expressed an opposite opinion in an op-ed piece in the local press. In his short time on the Council, to which he was appointed to a vacated seat, it's hard to track him as he goes back and forth on issues without a consistent rationale. Oddie has yet to be in an elected position, so we'll need to watch and see his consistency. Neither appears to embrace Green Party standards, so we're not endorsing them. WE DO RECOMMEND A VOTE FOR FRANK MATARRESE.

Alameda School Board Solana Henneberry & Gary Lym

Three candidates are running for two seats. It's time for incumbent Mike McMahon, who favors the superintendent and is biased against teachers, to move aside -- it's time to elect two new board members. Solana Henneberry and Gary Lym are stepping up to run. Both have children in Alameda public schools and both bring special talents; Mrs. Henneberry is a special education teacher in a nearby district and Mr. Lym has taught business courses at a Bay Area college.

Mrs. Henneberry supports locating our district office in a more cost effective location. She supports the bond because she sees the need for renovations. She states an interest in fostering innovative educational programs and is committed to collaboration and available to the community. And being a teacher with hands on classroom experience gives her a special edge in this race. VOTE FOR SOLANA HENNEBERRY

Mr Lym is a product of Alameda schools and has served several years as a parent member as well as chair on school site councils where his son attended. His background in

business and finance planning would serve him well in dealing with school budgets as a school board member. He mentions his commitment to supporting and working with teachers especially in professional development. He continues to volunteer at lunch time on campus, clearly demonstrating his commitment to better our schools. VOTE FOR GARY LYM

Alameda Healthcare District No Endorsement, please see questionnaires

Four candidates are running for three seats. All four candidates filled out our questionnaire, which can be viewed online at <http://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires/>. Unfortunately though, due to a last-minute shortage of volunteers to properly evaluate this race, we're not able to provide specific voting analysis or recommendations.

Alameda Measure I - No \$179 Million School Bond

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

City of Albany

Albany City Council: Election Cancellation Response

On August 21, 2014, the Albany City Council voted to cancel the November Council election and to appoint to the three open Council seats the three candidates who had filed papers to run. The Albany Greens expressed their concerns about the cancellation in the letter below:

August 20, 2014

From: Albany Green Party Election Committee

To: Albany City Council

Re: Potential Cancellation of City Council Election

Dear Mayor Wile and City Council Members:

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

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

We believe that, when the nomination period was extended due to an insufficient number of candidates, the City should have given broad public notice of this fact, including press releases and announcements in newspapers and other widely read local publications, flyers distributed around the city, and other means. The democratic process is best served when a range of candidates with a range of views runs for office, and a campaign enables voters to learn where each candidate stands on the issues and make an informed choice. We ourselves were not aware of the proposal to cancel the election until a few days ago and had to make an effort to find the relevant information on the city website.

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

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

2. *Cancelling the election now will prevent individuals who wish to enlarge the candidate field by running as write-ins from exercising their right under the state Elections Code to declare their candidacies until two weeks prior to the election (California Elections Code section 8601).* The issue here is not the merits of the current field of candidates but the democratic process that is intended to allow for others to step up and run if they choose, once they learn who the current candidates are. While we acknowledge that write-in candidates often do not win, the issue is one of principle: a write-in candidate has the right under the law to run and to make that decision up until 14 days prior to the election, and having additional candidates would force the current candidates to campaign or at least make their positions clear to the voters in order to distinguish themselves from the other candidates. The result would be a better opportunity for voters to make an informed choice among candidates.

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

4. *The staff report for Thursday's meeting offers no reasoned argument for cancelling the election but simply states facts: that the election code permits elections to be cancelled, and that the City would likely save approximately \$20,000, which was the cost of the prior Council election (in which 7 candidates ran for 3 seats. We recognize the money saved by not holding the election could be beneficially used for other purposes but ask whether that savings outweighs what is lost when the process of education and dialogue that is part of a campaign does not take place and voters are not offered the option of stepping up as write-in candidates. The fact that the code holds appointed candidates to be the same as elected candidates does not change the fact that appointments made 75 days before the election when few voters know this is happening are quite different from election wins that follow a campaign and informed debate.*

Sincerely,

David Arkin, Harry Chomsky, Kent Sparling, Nan Wishner, members of the Albany Green Party Election Committee, and Greg Jan, County Council member, Green Party of Alameda County

City of Albany

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

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

Incumbent Paul Black aligns strongly with several Green Party core values, specifically his emphasis on closing the achievement gap for underperforming/minority students. His focus on "authentic assessment...not standardized tests" is perfectly in keeping with Green values of social justice and respect for diversity. His questionnaire responses could have been stronger on the topic of sustainability, and his position on teachers' health benefits did not express awareness of the social inequities of employees paying for their own health care. At the same time, his experience on the board gives him valuable knowledge about the economic difficulties facing the district. For these reasons he earns our full endorsement.

Ross Stapleton-Gray's views do not show familiarity with the details of the district's challenges, and their alignment with Green Party values is mixed. Regarding sustainability and related issues, his views lacked specifics; his general support of incorporating gardens and a working farm into the curriculum, as well as his support of pursuing solar power options for the district, align with Green Party values of ecological wisdom and sustainability, but we wish he had fleshed out his ideas in these areas. With

regard to serving the varied learning needs of students, he focused on "precocious" students but did not mention under-performing, minority, or disadvantaged students. He supports alternative instructional approaches "where borne out by evidence" but did not elaborate on the type of evidence he would find persuasive, so it's not clear to what degree he would support grassroots/decentralized curriculum reform driven by teachers. He also supports later school start times but notes that this could pose problems for working parents, suggesting some sensitivity to the needs of a diverse population. In the absence of more clarity about his views, we endorse him with reservations.

Elliott Chin declined to return the Green Party questionnaire. In the absence of information about his candidacy other than his ballot statement, he receives no endorsement.

Albany Measure LL - YES, with reservations School Parcel Tax

The Green Party endorses Measure LL with reservations. The endorsement is because this measure funds education, which is consonant with a future focus. The reservation is because of the flat nature of this tax, rendered equally to every parcel—regardless of whether it is commercial or residential, or its assessed or true value—and the trend toward permanent local school funding in Albany represented by Measure LL, which extends the "temporary" Measure I of 2009. In the notable absence of reform or outright repealing of State Proposition 13, parcel taxes of this sort contribute to furthering social injustice.

Measures LL is a parcel tax placed on the ballot by the Albany Board of Education, requiring approval by two-thirds of voters for passage. Measure LL proposes a flat parcel tax of \$278/year for six years, equivalent to \$23.17/month, with an annual adjustment for inflation (~2 percent/year). This represents an increase of \$119/year above the current \$159 rate. The increase is to preserve the \$1.3 million/year revenue stream and to make up for lost revenue due to a court ruling that now prohibits taxing commercial property differently than residential property.

The measure continues senior and low-income exemptions for homeowners and a low-income rebate for renters. Measure LL adds a new exemption for parcels owned and occupied by persons receiving Supplemental Security

Income for a disability, regardless of age, or by persons receiving Social Security Disability Insurance benefits, regardless of age, and whose yearly income does not exceed 250 percent of the 2012 federal poverty guidelines (\$57,625 per year for a family of four). The added exemption for those on SSI/disability adds one more element that makes it marginally more socially just. Although the city provides information about the exemptions on the city website and in the senior center newsletter, the website information is difficult to find unless an individual knows where to look, and the exemptions apply to a broader group than seniors. More publicity is needed to ensure that the information about exemption provisions reaches all who are eligible.

The Albany Greens recognize the continued impact of the state's budget on Albany schools, and replacing lost funding is consistent with the Green Party value of future focus. Although there have been some small state funding increases as California emerges from the recession, Albany is still approximately \$4 million per year away from restoring previous levels. In 2013, California was ranked 49th in per-pupil funding (when adjusted for cost of living, 35th otherwise), providing 11 percent less than the national average.

At the same time, the Albany Greens remain concerned that the current state system of funding schools, which places ever-increasing pressure on local communities to fund their own schools, is not socially just. Localities that are able to do so tax themselves to increase funding for their school districts, producing unequal education for students across the state. Relying on local school taxes such as Measure LL recreates the inequities of the state's prior education funding system that was based primarily on local property taxes and resulted in vast differences in the amounts spent per pupil in wealthy vs. poor districts. These inequities were the subject of years of litigation during the 1970s and 80s, ending with the current state school funding strategy, which combines local property tax revenue with state funds in an attempt to provide roughly equal per-pupil funding across the state. To the extent that localities supplement state funding through local taxes, we return to a system of unequal funding in which students in poor districts typically suffer once again.

Five years ago Albany Greens noted that Measure J would make permanent another tax that was originally proposed as temporary, and we predicted that the District would be returning to make Measure I permanent in a few years. It is now so, and thus our continued reservations.

Berkeley Measures, City Council, School Board

Measure R

continued from page 1

provided, despite the promises made to voters of a variety of enhanced environmental and community benefits, and despite the 2010 up-zoning conferring a huge windfall for the private developers in the form of additional height and density. Yes, the historic street level façade is being saved, but we are losing a host of longtime small business that are doing just fine, including Ace Hardware, the kind of independent business we most value. Measure R 2014 requires developers to pay into a fund for loans to small businesses, helping to tide them over in the face of this kind of business disruption—or destruction.

The current Measure R 2014 makes good on the promises made to voters in 2010; namely that in exchange for the increased height and other incentives developers have obtained, they will in fact be required to provide meaningful community benefits, including increased affordable housing, payment of prevailing wages to construction, maintenance and hotel workers, and incorporating a multitude of "green" features in the new buildings. The maximum heights allowed are adjusted downward only slightly and only in areas closest to existing residential neighborhoods, and can be raised slightly in others under a penthouse provision.

This measure also establishes a Civic Center Historic District "overlay"—zoning restrictions on height and allowed uses that will protect the historic center of our downtown - including the Post Office - and stop the privatization of our Public Commons. At the time of this writing, the City Council is poised to enact the zoning overlay from Measure R, verbatim. But please don't be fooled: what the City Council votes for today can be undone after the election. Mayor Bates is on record stating that after the election Council can go back and provide "more flexibility" — double- speak for Council gutting the protections. The only way to truly protect our historic public resources is by a Yes vote on Measure R.

Those funding the opposition to Measure R — developers, real estate investors and politicians who take money from the development community - make a number of hysterical claims, but one in particular, that rents will skyrocket under Measure R, needs to be addressed. Berkeley and the Bay Area in general have had an affordable housing crisis for the last 40 years—rents in Berkeley have never gone down, and we are not going to build our way out of this problem by overdeveloping the Downtown with market rate housing.

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

Let's keep the big picture in mind—if we need to come back in two years and fix a detail that's OK. Right now, our Downtown Plan is badly broken, and if we don't pass these changes now, it will simply be too late. Once the Post Office is sold, and it's on the block right now, we can't get it back for public purposes later. Later will be too late. Once all the enormous new buildings in the pipeline have received their permits, we can't go back and get more affordable housing, fair wages for workers, green building features and all of the other community benefits. It doesn't work like that. If you are among those who quibble with one or another small element of Measure R, this is one time to avoid letting the "perfect" be the enemy of the "excellent." It's now or never to get the Green, Equitable and Civic Downtown we all were promised. Vote Yes on Measure R.

Berkeley Measure D - YES Berkeley vs. Big Soda

Yes it's Berkeley vs. Big Soda! Measure D is a straight forward general tax on the distribution of sugar sweetened beverages and sweeteners used to sweeten those drinks. The one cent per ounce tax will go into the General Fund. The measure also establishes a Sugar Sweetened Beverage Product Panel of Experts that will function like other City commissions. The Panel's purpose is to make recommendations on how and to what extent the City should fund programs to further reduce the consumption of sugar sweetened beverages, and to publish an annual report with those recommendations and the impact of this tax on the health of the city residents.

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

One of Big Soda's arguments in opposition is lack of accountability, something anti-tax advocates argue all the time. The Berkeley City Council opted for a general tax, since only a majority vote is required, and this means that the City Council can allocate the revenues as it sees fit. Had they chosen to make the measure a special tax that will fund only health oriented programs directly as San Francisco has, a 2/3rds vote would be required. (Big Soda is opposing that measure too.) The 2/3rds vote threshold is a hard one even for the most popular program with no well-funded opposition campaign, so can't we just trust our City Council this time? There are so many un- and underfunded health initiatives in our city! The other argument that there are

continued on next page

Berkeley Measures, Auditor, City Council

hidden exemptions to the tax “buried in the details” is just ridiculous: the ballot question, the one thing every voter can easily read, lists them all.

The Yes on D campaign tells us that one of the arguments they are hearing from voters is that the City shouldn't tell us what to put in our bodies. The simple answer to that is the City isn't: it's placing small a tax on one of the bad health choices its citizens make to cover part of the cost of those choices and to discourage you from making them.

Too often Greens reluctantly support regressive taxes because they are our only options. This is a tax on the distribution of something we don't need and would be better off without. So rejoice and vote Yes on Measure D! Let's be the first to beat Big Soda!

Berkeley Measure F - Either vote No in Protest OR Abstain from Voting Parks Tax

Measure F is an increase to the existing special tax for parks, trees and city landscaping, placed on the ballot by the City Council. This is a relatively modest increase in the existing parcel tax, which would raise the rate by 2.1 cents per square foot. For example, on a 1200 sq ft parcel, the tax would go from \$150.72 to \$175.92.

The Parks budget, which comes from this special tax and a few other sources, is running a structural deficit, and the City needs to fill the gap soon or cut staff and services. Depending on which numbers you use, the budget has already been cut between 15 percent and 25 percent, and the increasing cost of benefits for city staff expected in the next year will only make things worse. (This is not unique to the Parks Department, and these are not new benefits, just increases in the cost of existing benefits.)

This is the type of tax measure we would normally support, and usually without any reservations. Unfortunately, the hours of public meetings and contentious debate that led up to this particular measure being placed on the ballot has left the community supporters of parks at best disappointed, certainly disaffected, and with little enthusiasm to convince their friends and neighbors to tax themselves yet again. After months of work on the part of parks advocates to build a strong grassroots coalition to support a measure that would include both tax money for maintenance and bond money for popular and needed projects, the Council went against them and the recommendations of its own Commission in favor of this minimalist measure -- supported by senior city staff -- that is essentially unencumbered cash to plug the gaps in the budget.

So, how to vote? Since it is a special tax, this measure needs 2/3rds to pass. With most of the parks activists sitting this one out, that seems unlikely. Unfortunately, the organized opposition to this measure is the usual anti-tax folks. Voting No in the hopes that the City Council will get the message and work with its citizens on a better measure for 2016 might be heard simply as yet another anti-tax vote. But it's worth considering, as is simply choosing not to vote on this measure at all.

Berkeley Measure O - YES Recall of Elective Officers

This is a non-controversial measure that amends the recall provisions in the Berkeley City Charter to conform with changes in state law, with some additional clean-up language that clarifies the timelines and allows for the consolidation of elections. Recalls are rare in Berkeley politics; the last one was in 1973. When you see that two of the most progressive city councilmembers (Max Anderson and Jesse Arreguin) have actually signed the same “pro” ballot argument as two of the most conservative councilmembers (Susan Wengraf and Gordon Wozniak), you know that it's non-controversial. Vote Yes on Measure O.

Berkeley Measure P - YES Towards reversing *Citizens United v FEC*, corporate personhood, and money being equated with speech

Vote YES on P to help save democracy and our planet from corporate rule! Vote “yes” on Measure P to further the key solution to the root problem of our era. To stop corporate greed from trumping human need, the laws that gave corporations the power to run and to ruin our world must be changed. Supreme Court rulings, such as *Citizens*

United v FEC, created those laws, giving corporations constitutional rights that were intended for We the People. Amending the Constitution is the only way to overrule the Supreme Court (SCOTUS).

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

The Constitution was written to protect humans, not corporations that have super-human qualities like unlimited life spans and limited liability. Corporations don't vote, get heart disease, or fall in love. They are heartless. Confining constitutional rights to people will not harm legitimate business activities. Governments will still charter corporations, labor unions, etc. that can sign and enforce contracts, hold property, and be protected by the rights of their shareholders and members.

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

Limiting campaign spending will increase free speech because the 1 percent and corporations have ample means to drown out people's voices and do so. But corporate personhood's destructiveness extends beyond money and politics. Corporations use personhood to avoid inspections and hide health and safety threats, to avoid disclosing product origins and prevent us from knowing what is in our food, to void ordinances that protect local businesses from chains, and to avoid providing health care to employees.

Convince as many people as possible to vote “yes” on P to instruct our representatives that corporate personhood must be abolished, free speech is only for humans, and *Citizens United* must be overturned. A 28th Amendment to the constitution (House Joint Resolution 29 introduced by Rep. Nolan) declaring that “corporations do not have constitutional rights” and that “money is not free speech” is crucial to transform this corporate controlled plutocracy into a democracy. This message cannot be stated often enough. Since Californians were deprived from voting for Prop 49, Berkeleyans will send a strong message by approving Measure P

Berkeley Measure Q - YES Flex-time Initiative

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

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

Similar laws were passed in Vermont and San Francisco in 2013. In June 2014, President Obama adopted this policy for federal employees. Such laws have been successful in Europe for over a decade. Existing laws emphasize the benefit to families. Our 40-hour workweek dates back to 1938, when families were expected to have stay-at-home mothers. Today, most American families have no stay-at-home caregiver, and 90 percent of these families say they have trouble balancing work and family obligations. Today's working families need more flexibility than father needed 75 years ago.

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

The ecological benefits would be small initially but could be large in the long term. American work hours declined from 70 hours per week in 1840 to 40 hours per week in 1938, but they have not declined since. If we could get back on the track of gradually reducing average work hours, it would be much more feasible to build a sustainable economy during the coming century.

This initiative is endorsed by Bill McKibben, the nation's leading climate activist, who writes, “A valuable initiative. Academic research demonstrates shorter work hours cut carbon.” For more information, see www.flexible-worktime.com.

Berkeley Measure S - NO Redistricting Gerrymander

Vote NO on S to reject the majority Council's gerrymander scheme, aimed right at the heart of progressive Councilmember Kriss Worthington (see District 7 write-up). It disenfranchises voters, protects select incumbents, and punishes political enemies at the cost of neighborhood and communities of interests.

Redistricting in Berkeley has become a sordid saga stuck on repeat. Every ten years, boundaries are manipulated for political gain. But this time, the decennial debacle hit new lows with Council going to extremes to protect their gerrymander, including a tax-payer funded lawsuit against itself and community members.

Redistricting has been manipulated to influence elections. Council delayed redistricting to protect select incumbents in 2012, disenfranchising over 4,300 voters from being able to elect their Councilmember for 6 years. And again this year, Council purposely placed redistricting on the ballot in order to sue themselves and community members, temporarily imposing its gerrymander this election without voter approval -all to influence specific races.

Only two maps from the “community process” were independent of Council. All other maps were submitted by proxies directly connected to Council; 4 of 7 of the maps were by the same group of insiders stacking the deck to favor their gerrymander. All public input on the maps was ignored.

Council's Gerrymander divides communities for political gain. In creating a fraternity-dominated Student District, many low-income and minority students were intentionally excluded, dividing major neighborhoods, and favoring certain incumbents.

Measure S is an end-run around voters. A coalition of neighbors, students and community leaders successfully gathered 7,867 voter signatures to compel Council to fix its gerrymander. But rather than pass a fair map, Council deliberately chose to punt its gerrymander onto the ballot and then absurdly sued themselves and community members as a way to bypass process. You're now being asked to approve a map that Council has already imposed through a series of egregious misdeeds.

Measure S is the result of backroom deals and broken laws. Council never intended to resolve redistricting; they had already secretly hired lawyers with tax dollars well before having a chance to make things right. Their decision was timed to avoid transparency and enable their lawsuit in violation of the City Charter and open government laws. Having their gerrymander in place this election no matter what was the goal from the beginning.

Independent Redistricting will save money, spare the bickering, and bring this saga to a fair end. Though the Mayor kicked a Citizens Redistricting Initiative off this ballot to protect his gerrymander, rejecting Measure S will ensure that a permanent Citizens' Redistricting Commission will be in place to draw fair lines for the 2016 elections, and prevent future deadlocks. The “foxes will no longer be in charge of the hen house.”

Reject Council's Gerrymander scheme that will make the Council less progressive. Support the Citizens' Redistricting Commission. Join neighbors, students, and good government advocates in voting NO ON S.

Berkeley Auditor No Endorsement

Auditor Ann-Marie Hogan is again running unopposed. We didn't have quite enough volunteers to analyze her performance this year, so unfortunately we're not able to provide a recommendation. Of course, given that she's running unopposed, she's going to be re-elected anyway.

Berkeley City Council, District 1 Alejandro Soto-Vigil

Entrenched incumbent Linda Maio is facing a shake-em-up challenger in Alejandro Soto-Vigil, currently a Rent Board Commissioner. This race is important for bringing a more progressive balance to the Berkeley City Council, which has leaned moderate and ultra pro-development in recent years (led by Mayor Tom Bates). Linda Maio has been an automatic vote for the Bates machine and is too cozy with developers and development. For this reason, and her slow slide away from progressive politics, we cannot endorse or support her candidacy.

Alejandro Soto-Vigil is a young Latino husband and

continued on page 6

Council District 1*continued from page 5*

father settled in District 1, who wants for all of Berkeley what he wants for his children: affordable housing, quality schools, beautiful parks, economic security, and a sustainable environment. He has an active field campaign with support from some of the most progressive leaders in the Bay Area. He has endorsed the progressive Rent Board slate (Maio endorsed three of the landlord-backed candidates in the last election.)

The third candidate in this race is community activist Merrilie Mitchell. While we admire the passion she brings to the issues she takes on, we cannot recommend her. This race provides a clear choice between a progressive candidate and one who can no longer be counted on for progressive votes. It's now time that the voters in District 1 shake up Council a bit. Vote for Alejandro Soto-Vigil.

**Berkeley City Council,
District 4
Jesse Arreguin**

Six years ago the Green Party endorsed Jesse Arreguin to replace longtime Green Party member and District 4 Councilmember Dona Spring. Over the last six years Jesse has been a strong advocate for green values and a conscientious representative for his district. We enthusiastically endorse Jesse Arreguin for re-election to Berkeley City Council.

Jesse has been a champion for a host of progressive issues on the City Council, most notably leading efforts to promote sustainability and urban agriculture, advocating for Community Choice Aggregation and affordable housing, protecting rent control and tenant protections, and forcing the Council majority to take steps to protect the Downtown Berkeley Post Office. The Green Downtown Initiative, Measure R, is on the ballot because of Jesse. Thanks to Jesse's work with civil rights and immigrant rights advocates, Berkeley became the first City to refuse to honor ICE Detainer Requests as undocumented community members were being deported for minor non-violent crimes without due process, such as driving without a license.

In the wake of the Oakland Occupy and UC Berkeley Occupy crackdowns, Jesse worked with the ACLU, NAACP and other civil rights groups to amend the city's Mutual Aid policies, and pushed for police reforms that now prohibit police surveillance on individuals engaged in first amendment activity, stopped the sharing of reports on non-criminal activity with the FBI and other federal agencies, and prevents profiling and unwarranted investigation of Berkeley residents. And in the wake of the evil Measure S in the last election that would have criminalized sitting on the sidewalk, Jesse convened a Homeless Task Force, to effectively and comprehensively address the underlying issues of homelessness within a progressive framework. We have no doubt Jesse will continue to represent us well. www.jesseforberkeley.org.

**Berkeley City Council,
District 7
Kriss Worthington**

All-but-registered-Green Kriss Worthington has been the stalwart flagbearer for environmental consciousness on the Berkeley City Council since Green Party member Dona Spring died. He authored and pushed through the Zero-Waste and the Precautionary Principle measures, which compel the city to address the environmental effects of purchasing decisions. He won fossil-fuel divestment and strong city condemnation of the Keystone Pipeline, fighting off Mayor Bates' attempts to weaken both measures. For years he was the city's representative on Alameda County's Stop Waste and Transportation Commissions, and his good relationships with fellow commissioners allowed him to keep his influence even when conservative councilmembers Capitelli and Wozniak tried to force him off (the Transportation Commission reinterpreted its bylaws to keep him on as vice-chair even when Capitelli got himself appointed to replace him). There he wrote and guided crucial environmental legislation countywide; thanks to him we have the plastic bag ban, mandatory recycling and composting for apartments, and support for Community Choice Energy, all measures he first introduced in Berkeley that were rejected by the Bates Council majority.

Worthington has survived everything Mayors Shirley Dean and Tom Bates have thrown at him; perhaps he'll even survive the three-year-long gerrymander-justifying campaign that the Bates machine (Bates, and councilmem-

bers Capitelli, Maio, Wozniak, Moore, and Wengraf), orchestrated (at a cost to the city of well over \$1 million). The Council majority has packed the new so-called student district with the more conservative fraternities and sororities while carefully excising the progressive north campus coops and dorms that were part of District 7 for 12 years; the district lines reek of obvious gerrymander, extending a thin arm into the Willard neighborhood to keep Worthington in the district, as required by law. The Bates majority was depending on the ability of their UC Berkeley Student Action (frat party) allies to rally the students. Turns out they actually have no constituency: they weren't even able to come up with a student candidate to run (the supposed justification for a student-supermajority district), so the machine instead churned up one of their carefully cultivated trainees, 27-year-old Sean Barry, apparently on the theory that he looks more like a student than Worthington does (it's worth reading Barry's list of endorsers, a rogue's gallery of Bates wardheelers and machine wannabes). But Worthington, a former coop manager, has deep ties to the student community and has always appointed students to powerful city commissions; the majority of his appointees have always been students, and no other councilmember has ever had as much as one-fourth as many student appointees. Students he has mentored have gone on to elected positions and other key roles in progressive organizing.

Never have the forces arrayed against Worthington been so well orchestrated. The machine has spent a lot of time and (city) money, and intends to finally oust him. It should be our first priority to prove their efforts in vain. We cannot afford to lose this progressive leader!

**Berkeley City Council,
District 8****#1: Jacquelyn McCormick
(Ranked and sharing #2 & #3:
George Beier and Lori Droste)
[Stop Alvarez-Cohen]**

There are four candidates running for this finally vacant seat in Berkeley City Council District 8: Jacquelyn McCormick, George Beier, Lori Droste, and Michael Alvarez-Cohen are all vying to fill the seat vacated by Gordon Wozniak. Wozniak was probably the most consistently conservative vote on Council over the past few years; his replacement should help to improve the balance on Council. The new District 8 created by the gerrymandered redistricting plan now encompasses large parts of the more progressive neighborhoods formerly in District 7, making this a real race. Looking closely at these four candidates Michael Alvarez-Cohen is endorsed (and urged to run) by Gordon Wozniak and Mayor Tom Bates, and a slew of other primarily conservative and moderate supporters. We urge you to keep him from consideration. Berkeley employs ranked-choice voting, with voters able to pick their top three in a single candidate race.

Jacquelyn McCormick has supported rent control and the progressive Rent Board slate in the past, as well as the current Rent Board slate. She cares about neighborhoods, preservation, and limits on development and height. She is articulate and knowledgeable about quality-of-life issues and community capacity. She is supported by many of the progressive elected officials in Berkeley as well as many of our neighborhood and preservation leaders. We urge you to vote her first among your three choices.

Lori Droste is a bit of a cypher. When asked by some of us whether she supported rent control, her response was she would have to research the issue further. A candidate for City Council should not have to research such a fundamental issue, particularly since she serves on the Housing Advisory Commission. She has some progressive support from the LGBT community, but her support is thin and narrow. Rank her second or third on your ballot.

George Beier is a known entity, having run in District 7 already. His neighborhood has been gerrymandered into District 8, and if he is elected and Measure S fails (the redistricting plan) it will be curious to see what the City and other legal and governmental entities will make of two Councilmembers living in District 7 while one represents District 8. George has been a solid representative for his Willard neighborhood, and served on the Peoples' Park Advisory Board. He is not afraid of controversy and conflict, and can work with various factions in the City. He is not, at least on the face of it, beholden to the Mayor and the Council majority. We have no qualms about suggesting you cast him second or third on your ballot.

Please make use of all three of your ranked-choice slots: please vote for Jacquelyn McCormick first -- and then for your 2nd and 3rd choices vote for either George Beier followed by Lori Droste, or for Lori Droste followed by George Beier.

**Berkeley School Board
Ty Alper, Josh Daniels
and Karen Hemphill**

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

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

Karen Hemphill has served two terms and is vying for her third. She is fluent with District issues, has an established constituency, and has been consistently "present" on student performance and safety issues.

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

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

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

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

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

**** GO PAPERLESS ****

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

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

Thanks everyone!

City of Emeryville

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

Four candidates are running for two Emeryville City Council seats. Ken Bukowski will leave a political legacy in Emeryville. He served on the City Council for 24 years, and since having served on the council has tirelessly taped meetings of commissions and committees, posted on his website, along with tapes of city council meetings of many years, organized so as to make them accessible by topics over time. For this invaluable work he has been paid nothing. He has also organized small business owners so as to help them be aware of their rights and of actions being taken in City Hall that might affect them, though they had not been notified by council. This has helped small businesses have an effective voice in City Hall. Bukowski comments on issues regarding transportation, taxes, city budgeting and potential regional sources of income with unsurpassed depth. He is a pragmatist, who sees Bay Street as a successful project because it contributes 25% of the city's sales taxes, rather than as a failure because it has big box stores and inadequate bike paths. Bukowski's vote during his final term in office, to allow a zoning exception in order that a developer could build far higher than city law allowed, outraged the progressive community, but appeared pragmatic to him. He favors a city minimum wage law, but exempting present businesses and enforced by the state. Bukowski believes in listening to citizens, and organizing citizens to achieve benefits, such as his dream of free city wide wi-fi. He states that the end of redevelopment should usher in a new opportunity for community voices to be heard. He objects to web posting of agendas having eliminated their mailing without informing affected parties. His depth of understanding of the political history of Emeryville over the past quarter century is unsurpassed. Whoever else is elected to city council would do well to seek Bukowski's advice, and spend time absorbing his depth of knowledge regarding the workings of regional bodies as well as City Hall. No other candidate could have answered the Green Party questionnaire with the depth and detail with which Bukowski answered it. No one could be more dedicated to the city. It is unfortunate that Bukowski's unresolved legal issues involving mishandling of funds of a former campaign preclude the possibility of his being endorsed by the Green Party for a seat on the council.

Dianne Martinez has lived in Emeryville for four years. During that time she has given birth to two children, bought a house in town after having studied enough real estate law to represent herself as agent, and has done some freelance video production work with a locally based company. Most of her career, however, has been in Los Angeles, where she has worked as a producer on documentaries made round the world. Aside from having done some work for the Sierra Club earlier in life, she has had no prior political experience of any kind. Hers would be a steep learning curve, enabled by a supportive husband, having her children in day care, and not needing to hold any job other than City Councilor. Her answers to our questionnaire indicate that she would be an advocate for bicycle paths, pedestrian walkways, parks and open spaces. She has been meeting with Emeryville city staff and committee members, learning as much as possible about the job, which she approaches with the zest and intelligence she has clearly brought to her former career and family life. She is running on a slate with Scott Donahue. They have received the endorsement of four Emeryville city councilors, the Sierra Club, and local activist group RULE. As a Philipina, Martinez would like to represent an ethnic minority on the council, as well as a homeowner, and parent who expects to send her children to the Emeryville schools. Due to her lack of past political involvement in Emeryville or elsewhere, and her having had a career which would not in any way have prepared her for the complexities of a city council position, we can only endorse Dianne Martinez with RESERVATIONS, our endorsement based on her progressive values, her running on a slate with Scott Donahue, and her other progressive endorsements.

Scott Donahue has lived in Emeryville for 37 years. He has served on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee for the past ten years. He is well known as a public artist in the community, having produced several public sculptures, and having been part of the public arts scene for so many years. This is Donahue's first run for City Council. As a long time citizen and activist Donahue has some knowledge of the issues he would need to understand as a councilor, and would of course be a strong advocate on issues of bicycle and pedestrian needs. He is more visionary than pragmatist, and as opposed to Bukowski, Donahue's least favorite development in Emeryville is Bay Street,

which he dislikes for its lack of bicycle paths, big box stores, low wage jobs and lack of Community Benefits Agreements with the city. Donahue would bring to the council his artistic vision, progressive values, and long time dedication to Emeryville. On many issues he will need advice and direction, and his answers to our questionnaire indicated a superficial understanding of issues affecting city finances. He is running on a slate with Dianne Martinez. They have the endorsement of four city councilors, Unite Here Local 2850 and the progressive activist group RULE. Due to his longtime dedication and service to the city, including his committee participation, his progressive values, and endorsements, we think Scott Donahue deserves a chance to serve on the City Council.

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

Emeryville School Board Christian Patz

This year four School Board candidates are running for three seats. The three incumbents are John Affeldt, Miguel Dwin, and Christian Patz. A non-incumbent, Donn Merriam, is also running. We are only endorsing one candidate.

We have been troubled for some time by the School

Board at the tiny school district in Emeryville. A couple of years ago, more than 90% of the teachers retained by the district approached the Board with a resolution of 'no confidence' in the former Superintendent of Schools, asking for relief. The Board met their cry for help with a doubling down on the former Superintendent and the teachers were ignored.

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

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

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

Emeryville Measure K - Yes, with reservations School Parcel Tax Renewal

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

Emeryville Measure U - YES Becoming a Charter City Emeryville Measure V - YES Property Transfer Tax

Measures U and V are connected and would change the town's governing system and impose a real estate transfer fee. Measure U changes Emeryville from the existing 'general law' governing structure that gives more power to Sacramento to a 'charter city' that provides for local, decentralized control. Charter cities, common in California, are called "home rule" cities because they give more power to the people in their respective towns. Measure U must pass for Measure V, the real estate transfer fee, to be valid. Measure V provides a fee for both residential, and more importantly, commercial real estate transfers. The lion's share of these fees would be borne by the commercial sector but the proposed fee would still make Emeryville cheaper than the transfer fees of the charter city neighboring towns of Oakland and Berkeley. Measure V would provide much needed revenue for resident amenities such as parks, bike facilities, child care, youth programs and infrastructure such as sewer and storm drain maintenance. The Green Party recommends a strong yes on Measures U and V.



*reliable
residential
real estate
services*

KATE TANAKA, REALTOR®

510.914.8355 / kate@redoakrealty.com

www.KateTanaka.com / CA DRE No.01360386

6450 Moraga Avenue
Oakland, CA 94611

Green since 1992



Oakland Measures, Mayor

Oakland Measure N - No Endorsement School Parcel Tax

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

It differs from the most recent parcel tax effort in 2010, Measure L, which called for a \$195 annual assessment, and failed by less than 1 percent, with opposition by anti-charter school advocates, including the teachers union (the Oakland Education Association).

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

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

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

In light of all these concerns, we should likewise be neutral, acknowledging the need for such funds and programs, but rejecting the charter impact and its regressive nature.

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

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

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

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

What we have is mostly a system to award contracts in response to requests for proposals and for that we have inadequate oversight, especially of results. As the farmed out projects are not really city programs, the ongoing review needed for year to year improvement has nowhere to live. Funds were not always spent on what the measure promised and there was no redress.

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

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



Oakland Measure CC - YES, with reservations Public Ethics Commission

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

While having laws in the Charter makes it more difficult for the City Council to meddle, it also makes for a less flexible law that can only be changed by the voters. One example in this proposal is that it sets the term of PEC members at three years. There are many arguments for making the term four years; it would greatly increase the institutional knowledge of the PEC, and provide each of the elected officials with power to appoint PEC members with one appointment per term in office. Currently this limitation is contained in the Oakland Municipal Code, and it can be changed by a vote of the City Council. If it is decided a different term of office would be better, the City Council can make the change, but by placing this restriction in the City Charter, it will require the time and cost of an election to make the change.

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

Oakland Measure DD - NO Independent Redistricting Commission

This charter amendment would transfer the authority to draw district boundary lines, for the City Council and Oakland Unified School District Board, from the City Council to a redistricting commission. Redistricting is done every ten years, most recently in 2013 for the election happening now (November 2014).

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

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

Oakland Measure EE - YES Oakland Municipal Retirement System Termination

Measure EE will terminate the Oakland Municipal Retirement System (OMERS) initiated in 1939. Since 1970, all new Oakland employees are paying into CalPERS (California Public Employees Retirement System), and thus the only remaining participants in OMERS are currently 22 retirees, with an average age of 91.

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

Philadelphia to facilitate this process.

Such a measure would seem rather obscure and even insignificant, if it were not for the fact that we live in an age of public employee pension bashing and privatization. That said, this initiative appears generally positive, with the city agreeing to be the ultimate guarantor of benefits and with no seeming reduction for the recipients. Moreover, savings from this changeover will go into a temporary reserve fund to facilitate the process of transition; any potential problems will be more than covered by this fund. The more immediate gain would total \$900,000 for Oakland (largely from the savings on OMERS administrative overhead, which is nearly equivalent to the payouts), and from the remaining funds, could be up to a \$2.9 million return, depending on the longevity of the recipients.

In truth, this seems to counter the current trend of denigrating public employee pensions; the ending of a public institution is acceptable since it is in its final stage regardless. Nonetheless, we can use any discussion on this measure to raise broader concerns about the attacks on pensions, especially PERS and STRS (State Teachers Retirement System), and the rights of working people to a secure retirement. Thus, we advocate a YES vote.

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

The Oakland Mayor's race is between 15 ballot candidates, a write-in candidate and a dog with a website. Six candidates of the enfranchised group: the incumbent, two members of Council, the City Auditor, a Port Commissioner and a former school board member are running against each other. The other well-funded candidate is a teacher and broadcaster. All 17 of the candidates except for one filled out our questionnaire; you can view their responses at: <http://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires>.

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

Dan Siegel is our recommendation for the #3 ranked vote, with reservations. Siegel has a fantastic record as a civil rights and labor lawyer and a long and respectable history as a local radical progressive. His platform has put real social concerns from the minimum wage to restorative justice up front and he has personal credibility on all these issues. He has the skills to manage police reform and the history to implement community policing. The people who have joined together around Dan's campaign also have personal credibility as committed local activists. If he is elected, we hope he will draw on this pool for city staff.

Our reservations come from his lackluster history as part of local government, his law firm's relationship with the city and his heavy involvement in unproductive, harsh partisanship in the infighting around local public radio, supporting the so-called "SaveKPFA" faction. Dan is not new leadership for Oakland progressives, but his supporters are. Even with that in mind, Oakland would be much better off and we as a people would likely move forward politically if Dan Siegel were elected Mayor of Oakland.

Parker, Ruby, Schaaf and Tuman hold similar views and make similar proposals. The focus of these four candidates is "public security first" and "get business growing jobs" proposals, without anything like the same commitment of resources to equity and social justice which they seem to want to address in "round two" once the city has less crime

continued on next page

Oakland Mayor, Auditor, City Council

and more jobs. This we have all heard before and in practice, the round one is usually not as successful as promised and the round two usually does not benefit the residents who need it most.

Parker distinguishes himself in that even if he has a business background, he does not see government running as a business, he sees it as something to provide service to the public, especially the public that needs it most. Ruby claims that there is much money to be saved by cleaning up waste in government, as one would expect the Auditor to say. She's giving up the Auditor job for a mayor's race she will probably lose. Schaaf is also giving up another term, for her on council, to make a long shot bid. Schaaf is for more police with intelligent police practice, typical of her smart, informed, nuanced considerations. It is surprising that Ruby and Schaaf both didn't just stay where they were and support Tuman or Parker, or both. Schaaf is a co-member of a pro higher police staffing group, with Tuman, who started his campaign way before Schaaf, giving up his on-air job to run. Tuman is especially strong on analysis and the importance he places on city officials doing their jobs more professionally and is the clearest on his support of higher staffing levels for the Oakland Police and his willingness to pay the price for it. Good folk all four, but we can not recommend voting for their policies.

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

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

What happened around Occupy was a coordinated political crime committed in a series of US cities against political dissent, and Jean was part of the crackdown planning. There was no need to send the riot squad out for what at worst was illegal camping. People were out protesting the banks, finance and the 1 percent. There was no emergency other than for the powers that be, who needed those tents down and for those protests to stop. Thus the teargas flowed. Mayor Quan calls their poor performance a set of mistakes, but she has never come clean about her involvement in this crackdown and what that 20 mayor conference call was all about.

No progressive should vote for her.

The seven "also-rans" range from Nancy Sidebotham, who is a fairly reasonable, well informed critic of the local government, running for office in order to bring up avoided financial mismanagement issues in the candidate forums, to Peter Liu who waives a pistol on his web page, and will improve the economy by teaching young people the rules of capitalism via his own video game. Ballot candidates Houston, Liu, McCullough, Sidebotham, Williams, and Wilson; write-in candidate Sam Washington; and satirical (unofficial) candidate Einstein, all have something to add to the conversation, but none inspire us Greens to recommend voting for them.

This candidate list shows again that Oakland needs more unified, sustained progressive politics that advances civil rights, economic justice and social guarantees, via government action that gets us out of the rat race, not just prepares us to be faster running rats. We need a broad based Oakland Progressive Alliance free and clear of Democratic Party controls and not accepting big money. Please vote in this election and start thinking about who we should run in the next ones.

Oakland City Auditor No Endorsement

The Oakland City Charter delineates the responsibilities of the Auditor and makes the position an important part of the checks and balances of city government. A strong auditor benefits all the residents of the city by bringing fiscal and management accountability to city activities. Courtney Ruby, the current Auditor, is running for mayor leaving the office open for a new person to hold the position. The two candidates for Oakland City Auditor present a difficult choice for Oakland voters. Brenda Roberts has an extensive background as an auditor in both the private and public sector, but she is a political neophyte who appears to know little about Oakland city government. Roberts' answers to the Green Party Questionnaire were telling and shows her lack of knowledge of Oakland city government. When asked what needs an audit or re-audit in the next year her response was, "[without a full in-depth review of the City departments, budget and programs, I could not state that I am aware of a specific area or function that should be included in the annual or multi-year audit plan at this time." We would expect a candidate for City Auditor to have enough knowledge of the city to know at least one thing that needs to be audited.

On paper, Roberts' opponent Len Raphael is the superior choice, but he comes with significant baggage that makes him a difficult choice for the office. Raphael has a significant history of following and participating in Oakland politics. He knows the City and his answers to the Green Party Questionnaire had specific proposals concerning what the City auditor needs to do. The questions about Raphael are about style, and underlying philosophy. Raphael (like Roberts) is a former registered Republican. In 2012 he was a candidate for City Council in Dist.1 and also participated in the effort to recall Mayor Jean Quan. Raphael has a style that can be quite abrasive, and we question whether he could have the political deftness to negotiate the pitfalls of Oakland city government. While we do think he would shine a light on important issues, his approach could make him ineffective.

City Council, District 2 (Don't vote for King or Maxey)

This is an open seat, as Pat Kernighan is not running for re-election. There are five candidates. Ken Blackburn is concerned with "closing the gap of services that are not properly distributed." While he uses the stock phrase "a better Oakland for everyone," he explains his concern. He is concerned with "longtime residents and newcomers alike." Blackburn wants "additional commissions and citizen groups from all parts of the City" to "help improve the responsiveness of our city government." Blackburn works with the Affordable Housing Program of a bank which has resulted in affordable housing projects in Oakland. He proposes programs to provide services for youth, rather than the "curfew" approach. Blackburn has arranged for the "Mendocino Outdoor Science School to take inner-city classrooms from Oakland, Richmond, and San Francisco to the Mendocino Woodlands for a weeklong outdoor education program," for many Oakland students, their first such experience. He supports Restorative Justice programs and Community Policing, although he also wants to "fully staff the police force," which sounds like increasing its numbers. We cannot recommend candidates who favor increasing the police force.

Andrew Park's answer to our question about restorative justice was impressive. He has experience supporting youth during restorative justice proceedings, and sees it as important and positive. Andrew was the only candidate who recognized that the City Council District boundaries are drawn in such a way as to underrepresent parts of the community. Andrew has a long list of individuals endorsing him. However, Andrew doesn't seem to realize how City Council has been overly influenced by developers. For example, he supports the Oak to Ninth (Brooklyn Basin) project.

Abel Guillen currently serves as a Peralta Community College District Trustee (and is currently the President of the Board), and as Vice President of an East Bay school finance firm. Most of the Democratic Party establishment endorses him and he is a standard-issue Democratic Party liberal, endorsed by the Alameda County Labor Council, a number of unions, and many elected officials (Mayor Jean Quan, Deputy Mayor Sandre Swanson, City Council members Pat Kernighan and Dan Kalb, to name a few). We have had a sad history of electing liberals to City Council with no real change in how Oakland is governed and we have no reason to expect Abel to make a difference.

Dana King politely declined to return our questionnaire. Her campaign literature includes lots of platitudes (such as "We need strong leaders who are willing to try new approaches", unspecified, "instead of just following the same tired and unsuccessful policies," unspecified. She wants "at least 800 police officers." She is endorsed by Mike Ghielmetti (the developer who is bringing us the Oak to Ninth (Brooklyn Basin) project). We see no reason to support her for City Council.

Ken Maxey is business-oriented; he's on the Board of Directors of the Oakland Chamber of Commerce. He works for Comcast, as a Government Affairs Executive. He did not return our questionnaire, and was not present at the League of Women Voters Candidate Forum on September 10, where the other four candidates appeared. We see no reason to support him for City Council.

We are not endorsing or ranking Blackburn, Park, and Guillen. For more information, see their questionnaires at <http://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires/> and please do NOT vote for Dana King or Ken Maxey.

City Council, District 4 (Don't vote for Broadhurst or Lim)

This race is a no-brainer. 60 percent of Oakland's residents are tenants. Important tenant and affordable housing issues come before the Oakland City Council. We don't want Jill Broadhurst, the Executive Director of the East Bay Rental Housing Association—a lobbying group for landlords—to be making Council policy. Her campaign website, <http://www.jill4oakland.com/>, does not name the organization she works for. In the questionnaire she submitted, Broadhurst wrote that tenants are already protected with a strict Rent Control policy. We vehemently disagree. To protect tenants from rapidly rising rents that gentrification brings, Oakland needs real rent control, which its current rent law does not provide.

Broadhurst opposes the Oakland Minimum Raise proposal (Measure FF on the November ballot), preferring a gradual approach. She is unsure about Rank Choice Voting. She would not vote for joining with other cities to use eminent domain to address the foreclosure crisis.

Anne Campbell Washington, a former city staffer, has experience and knowledge of city issues, operations, and finances. She was appointed to the District 4 Oakland School Board seat in mid-2013. At that time, Campbell Washington said she would run in 2014 for the School Board seat, but she decided to run for Council when Councilmember Schaaf opted to become a candidate for Mayor. See <http://www.annieforoakland.com/>

Campbell Washington has extensive ideas for improving life in Oakland. She believes in mitigating or restricting development that causes current residents to be "pushed out." A priority is affordable housing and preserving Oakland's diversity. She backs the City Council's funding of a study which would set the stage for a citywide developer impact fee for affordable housing. She supports businesses that provides for residents' needs, local independent enterprises, and artists. She recognizes Oakland's competitive advantage -- the availability of manufacturing areas in East and West Oakland, separate from residential areas, and conducive to the creation of well-paying jobs.

The question is how much she can be her own person after being chief-of-staff for Jerry Brown and Jean Quan.

continued on next page

Read the CANDIDATES' QUESTIONNAIRES Online

For the special district races, all of the candidates returned our questionnaires, and for the city races in Alameda, Emeryville, and Oakland, almost all of them did so. You'll find lots of additional info in the candidates' completed questionnaires, so we strongly encourage you to read them on our website: <http://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires/> (Or, you can simply go to: acgreens.org, and then click on the "Candidate Questionnaires" tab near the top of the page).

Oakland City Council, School Board

Oakland City Council

continued from page 9

She seems serious about “moving the ball” for more than herself, but there is nothing radical here. She would expand community policing and restorative justice programs. But like others running for office in Oakland, she wants a police force of 900 officers, though she offers no rationale for that number and no explanation of how to pay for it. Another negative, Campbell Washington has worked with GO Public Schools, which advocates for charter schools, and as a School Board member she voted to approve new charter schools.

Paul Lim has no formal relationships with Oakland community organizations. He is running his campaign via <https://www.facebook.com/paul.lim.9440?fref=ts> Lim supports solar development. He criticizes heavy responses by “loose cannons” in law enforcement. He asks “How about we level the playing field and force all candidates to run with zero funding?” He sees getting Oaklanders to care about the city as a way to reduce violence. The one big thing Lim wants to fight for is a city wide recreation program for all ages.

Many of Lim’s views are closer to Broadhurst’s. He opposes Measure FF (Minimum Wage), suggesting instead that low-paid workers practice “cost savings.” He is against Ranked Choice Voting. A believer in trickle-down economics, Lim wants Oakland to be “friendlier to business to keep jobs in Oakland.” He mistakenly believes that all businesses are good for Oakland. Lim says that the Golden State Warriors are an asset to Oakland when they refused to name themselves the Oakland Warriors and are already moving back to San Francisco again to be called the San Francisco Warriors.

City Council, District 6 Write in Vicente Cruz (Don’t vote for Johnson or Moore)

Vicente Cruz is a long standing active Oakland Green. He made a nearly successful bid for Martinez School Board and has been planning for some years to run for Oakland School Board. He supports Gonzalez for 6th district school board. Vicente has been active around youth and school issues, along with helping the Green candidates for Council, Mayor, and Peralta Junior College trustee. He has served on the Measure Y oversight commission. Vicente is well experienced with local government as an informed grass roots activist. When the Oakland Greens found ourselves disappointed with the 4 registered candidates, Vicente Cruz accepted to register as a write in candidate and campaign in the district where he lives. A vote for Vicente is a vote for the ten core values of the Green Party and it is a vote for a constituent service focused member of council if elected. District 6 would be very happy with Vicente Cruz to represent them.

The incumbent Brooks, and the “challenger” Nosakhare have declared similar policy positions in their questionnaire replies to the Alameda Greens. Those positions were usually well considered, sometimes positive, sometimes not. Both pro some kind of restorative justice and not really for a police commission. Both take the current practice and structure for granted and propose no reforms.

Nosakhare works for District 4 council member and mayoral candidate, Libby Schaaf and is in no way a newcomer or outsider. Nosakhare calls for “change” but from what to what, she is not so clear. Everyone involved is less

** GO PAPERLESS **

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

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

Thanks everyone!

clear about the divisions on the current council. What role did Schaaf, Nosakhare, and others play when council president Kernighan kicked Brooks off the Coliseum Authority? Some of this election may be about a behind the scenes conflict that has not been explained to the public. Nosakhare is in a couple Democratic clubs, including Wellstone.

In public and in writing Brooks talks up her accomplishments and experience. She has a lot of experience, but board members have accomplishments when they have majority. Brooks has been there at times. She is known as a long standing progressive. When Occupy started, she had her own tent, but later she was standing with council member Reid together with the Chamber of Commerce asking for a second raid to clear the encampment. A vote for Brooks or Noshakhare is a vote for an insider, one with more experience and baggage than the other.

The other two candidates are both qualified, but not in sync with what the Oakland Greens have been advocating. With James Moore we will have to agree to disagree with his version of a “pro business” approach. On the other hand, he takes a more progressive stand on restorative justice, police accountability, politician accountability than the two “insider” candidates. Moore has a list of proactive things he would do with a council seat reaching out to his district with some good ideas in it. We part company with him again when he advocates police regularly in our schools, but his intent with the idea is to heal, not intimidate. He has ideas worth listening to.

With Michael Johnson we part company with his uncritical attitude towards big development projects but note that he was clear that not all the jobs promised ever materialize for the communities. He is also new to many issues despite being a very active Young Democrat, member of clubs and attending Block by Block and Wellstone meetings. His approach to crime brings in some ideas such as dealing with many issues as medical, not criminal, problems. The Hope for Oakland theme sounds like just advertising akin to Noshakhare’s “change”.

Vote for Vicente—if you can, go to a candidate forum. All the candidate questionnaires that they handed in are posted at: <http://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires/>

School Board, District 2 No Endorsement

The Oakland’s People’s District 2 school board race has two candidates, Aimee Eng and William “Bo” Ghirardelli. Both candidates turned in their questionnaire with Mr. Ghirardelli needing an extension, but he failed to answer all of the questions. The Green Party of Alameda County could not find any reason to endorse either candidate; both questionnaires did not have in-depth policy answers, using instead catch phrases and trigger words to answer. Mr. Ghirardelli’s web site did not work when attempted but the Alameda County Greens/Oakland Greens encourage you to research for yourselves and you can view all of the county candidate questionnaires at: <http://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires/>.

School Board, District 4 Karl Debro, with reservations (Don’t vote for Shakir-Gilmore)

The Alameda County/Oakland Greens have long stood against the *status quo*—it is for that reason you could pick any of the candidates running for OUSD board in People’s District 4. We chose Karl G. Debro who has a good level of knowledge of Oakland education, seems to be mostly against charter schools, hopefully leading to better public education. He is against school closures although our reservation is his stance on school police. We encourage no support for Saleem Shakir-Gilmore on his anti-union position.

The Alameda County Green Party/Oakland Greens encourage you to research their web sites. All but Nina Senn returned their questionnaire; you can view all county candidates’ questionnaires at: <http://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires/>

School Board, District 6 Shanthi Gonzales

There are only two candidates in this race, with Chris Dobbins, the incumbent, choosing not to run. The first is Shanthi Gonzales and the second is Renato Almanzor. While neither has a significant track-record with the Oakland School District, there appears to be a clear favorite. Ms. Gonzales has a significant history advocating for Oakland libraries and other community services and has left-leaning politics; there is little evidence of such a resume from Mr. Almanzor, who is an academician and a technocrat.

Moreover, Ms. Gonzales challenges the prevalent dynamic of education deform, standardized-testing-obsession and expansion of charter schools. She is endorsed by the Oakland Education Association and other unions, as well as parent activists like Curtissa Clay. She has a well-organized campaign and is open to policy discussion including with Greens. She has a history of union activity with SEIU and comes from a labor-focused family.

Mr. Almanzor is backed by GO Public Schools, an organization funded by the Rogers (Dreyer’s Corp.) Foundation, a local version of Eli Broad’s neo-liberal politics. They advocate for much of the same deform policies as Arne Duncan. His responses on a wide range of issues (Common Core, charter schools, adult education) reflect a lack of awareness and were overly vague. He would be a weak presence on the Oakland School Board, while Ms. Gonzales would be a distinct improvement over any of the current Board members.

Therefore we both endorse and actively support Shanthi Gonzales.

Do you know what the Jobs and Housing Coalition is?

Do you think that the Jobs & Housing Coalition is a cool progressive group? If you do, you’d be wrong. The Jobs and Housing Coalition is not what its name implies. It is a conservative 501(c)(3) non-profit—“consisting of senior executives of major companies in Oakland” where “membership on the Board of Directors is limited to the top executives of leading businesses”—according to its website (www.jobsandhousing.com). In other words, this organization represents landlords and employers seeking low wages, high rents, and increased profits. This business advocacy group is a membership organization with an annual budget of over \$300,000 in 2012. It has been paying for the polling of voter preferences in the current Oakland election races.

President and CEO Greg McConnell spends a great deal of time lobbying at City Hall. Recently, he spoke out against Lift Up Oakland’s minimum wage proposal (now Measure FF) and efforts to join Richmond in using eminent domain to protect homeowners with underwater mortgages. He represents landlords in Rent Board cases. In 2002 he fought Measure EE (Just Cause Eviction protection). And for many years he has opposed campaigns to better protect tenants from rising rents.

Voters should be suspicious of the double-speak of the Jobs and Housing Coalition’s name. This may be one of the most ominous political groups in Oakland, especially since most people have never heard of it.

Green Sundays

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

When: Second Sunday of the month, 5:00-6:30pm

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

Wheelchair accessible.



County Offices & Measures, Judicial Offices

County Superintendent of Schools

Don't vote for Foster

In this past June's election we took a 'No Endorsement' position in this race, which then had five candidates. The position is still one of significant importance, dealing with a budget of \$45 million and regulating 18 school districts with over 400 schools. The County Superintendent's role is now of more importance with enhanced fiscal powers under the new Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) for schools and its governance structure, LCAP (Local Control and Accountability Plan).

The selection is now down to two candidates: Karen Monroe and Helen Foster. We still have deep reservations about Monroe, being the hand-picked candidate of outgoing Superintendent Sheila Jordan and clearly a representative of the Democratic Party mainstream. She is a fiscal conservative and has not shown strong opposition to charter schools. Moreover, as Associate Superintendent, Monroe demonstrated no advocacy for the idea that the Oakland District should spend at least 55% of state funding on schools and staff, as required by State Education Code.

That said, we have gathered further information on her opponent and we are now recommending a "Don't vote for Foster" position. Beyond Foster's strong support for the 'Common Core' (which is the new push nationally for a curriculum said to be more innovative but in reality tied to standardized testing), and her lack of clarity regarding the rights of unions to strike, she has knowingly provided cover justifying the recent Vergara decision, which not only

is a union-busting case attacking seniority and due process for teachers, but one which would undermine stability in many of the most underserved schools in poorer working class areas.

This is totally unacceptable and thus, we must make a strong statement in opposition to Foster and her backward thinking.

County Measure BB - Yes County Transportation Expenditure Plan

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

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

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

Revenue from the plan would restore, upgrade, and expand BART, AC Transit, and commuter rail services, and keep fares affordable for seniors, youth, and people with disabilities. Bicycle and pedestrian safety and education projects would receive major funding boosts. There are some funds for local street improvements, such as repairing

potholes and seismic improvements. Nine percent would go to local highway projects such as building high-occupancy lanes. All expenditures must go to benefit Alameda County residents. Many local jobs will also be created.

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

Although a 30-year sales tax increase seems burdensome, it is necessary to fund long-term improvements to transportation infrastructure visions. Federal and State grants are only available to those localities which can guarantee matching funds over many years' duration.

It is true that sales taxes are regressive, meaning they impact low income people at a higher rate than higher income people (although more absolute dollars are contributed by high-income high-spenders). Unfortunately, there are no good alternatives for gathering local funds. AC Transit and BART already get money from parcel taxes, and the idea of increasing parcel taxes even further is resisted by homeowners. Gasoline taxes are already extraordinarily high (Oregon is experimenting with a Vehicle Miles Travelled tax as a replacement).

There are also concerns about the 5 percent of the plan's budget which is allocated to the Livermore BART extension. Some critics say this is too much money, some say it's too little, and some say the entire idea must be scrapped. It is our feeling that this complex issue should not stop our supporting the measure as a whole, which proposes to make many positive improvements for the people and environment of Alameda County.

We recommend you vote Yes on Measure BB.

Judicial Offices

State Supreme Court Justices

Mariano-Florentino Cuellar, Goodwin Liu, Kathryn Werdegar Yes, with reservations

Liu and Cuellar are recent appointees to the California Supreme Court, while Werdegar has been on the court since 1994, when she was appointed by then-governor Pete Wilson.

While we appreciate the racial diversity that Liu and Cuellar bring to the court, they bring little diversity of social class or professional experience. Both attended Ivy League schools, and both have primarily worked as law professors, rather than as judges or practitioners. Cuellar spent some time in the Obama White House, while Liu spent some time working for a large corporate law firm. We would prefer to see more diversity of experience and more focus on public service.

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

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

Werdegar, despite having been appointed to the California Supreme Court by Pete Wilson, has a significantly more diverse background. She entered the practice of law when it was not common for women to do so, and has a greater breadth of experience than Liu or Cuellar, including working as a court research attorney and Court of Appeals judge. She is considered to be more toward the "liberal" side of the Court, and voted with the majority of the Court to strike down California's ban on gay marriage.

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

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

Justices Cuellar and Werdegar, while voting with the majority, did not say anything about their reasoning, but Justice Liu did. In essence, Liu stated that it is not clear that the legislature is allowed to place advisory measures on the ballot, and since it does not actually do anything (like enacting a new law), there was no harm in taking it off while the case was pending. He seemed to regard Proposition 49 as an act of legislative grandstanding, rather than real legislation. Cantil-Sakauye argued that there was no harm in leaving it on the ballot (perhaps because it does not really do anything). Given that all of the justices, including Cantil-Sakauye, think that they should review the case on the merits, this becomes a fairly narrow and technical disagreement over an issue whose symbolism (although of course we Greens do oppose Citizens United) has been overblown by the media, and accordingly it does not change our analysis or recommendation.

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

State Appellate Court No Endorsements

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

It is currently beyond the capacity of our Voter Guide

to review every opinion that the district appellate judges have either authored or joined over the past term. We are therefore not endorsing either a "Yes" or a "No" vote on the retention/confirmation of the state appellate court judges on the ballot. Press accounts of state appellate court judicial holdings are relatively rare, and reviewing the opinions authored or joined by each during their 12 year terms would require several months, if not years, of advance preparation.

Finally, since 1998 the Green Party has criticized the Governor's judicial appointment system, which is dominated by special interests. The three-member commission that must ratify his appointments is a mere rubber stamp. Prosecutors, supported by police and prison guards, have exercised an undue influence on this outdated 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 firm partners, and those with tenure in a lower court. Racism and sexism are rampant. The present system of judicial selection does nothing to elevate the standards of judicial qualifications and has created a self-perpetuating judiciary free from the control of the people.

The Green Party has previously suggested that judicial term limits be considered and that new selection methods be devised. We have supported renewed scrutiny in the selection of candidates and public financing of judicial campaigns.

Over the years since 1998, no great wellspring of popular support for the types of reforms we have proposed has arisen. What's more, some Greens and other progressives believe that judges should be less exposed to the popular political whims of the electorate. They cite the 1986 right-wing backlash and ultimate removal of Supreme Court Justice Rose Bird over her opinions challenging the constitutionality of California's death penalty. Justice Bird was the first female justice of the state Supreme Court and the first state supreme court or appellate judge ever to be removed by the voters. We believe that this issue needs considerable debate and we would like to hear from Greens and other progressives in the legal community on both sides of this issue who might have insight as to the wisdom and impact of such changes.



Create and Preserve Memories
Share your stories with Family

D. Anne Bruetsch
Klassy Kat Productions
Live Recording, Personal Histories, Video Production
(510) 604-9124

Special Districts

EBMUD Board

continued from page 1

Instead, Ms. Foulkes has focused on obtaining supplemental water supplies, trading EBMUD's controversial American River federal water contract for part ownership of a water treatment plant on the Sacramento River. (Water is shared with the City of Sacramento and Sacramento County.) Ms. Young, however, points out that this new water costs EBMUD about \$500 per acre-foot and wonders whether water conservation might have been a less expensive way of reducing EBMUD's need for supplemental supplies.

More generally, Ms. Foulkes favors pursuing all possible avenues for increasing East Bay MUD's supplies, including buying into an expanded Los Vaqueros Reservoir and building a regional desalinization facility. Ms. Young is much less enthusiastic, pointing out that desalinization is both very expensive and potentially environmentally damaging and that the Los Vaqueros reservoir stores lower quality Delta water, compared to EBMUD's current Mokelumne River source. (EBMUD's new supplemental Sacramento River water is also of somewhat lower quality than the Mokelumne.)

In terms of support, Ms. Foulkes is supported by the four more conservative current EBMUD directors as well as virtually all Piedmont elected officials and some officials in Orinda and Moraga. Ms. Young is supported by the more progressive current and former EBMUD directors, several Oakland City Council members, both of EBMUD's major employee unions as well as other labor organizations, and environmental organizations including Sierra Club and Clean Water Action.

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

AC Transit, At Large Dollene Jones, with reservations

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

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

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

Andrews seems to have little experience with transit but she has picked up smart growth nomenclature, which she puts in caps in her questionnaire answers. Jones lives and breathes buses and even attends most board meetings. As a retired bus operator, she may have a limited perspective but she would not vote for buses whose cost would impact service! She would do no harm. You can view the candidates' completed questionnaires on our website, at: <http://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires/>.

AC Transit, Ward 4 Murphy McCalley

Ward 4 consists of Ashland, Castro Valley, Cherryland, San Lorenzo and portions of Hayward and San Leandro. Murphy McCalley is a retired transportation professional that is at a point in his life where he "would like to give back and help to make things better for our community." Not only does he have an impressive resume including serving as Chief Financial Officer for two California transportation agencies, but also grew up in the East Bay riding AC Transit. His family, as he put it, "...were 'green' before it was cool. We did not own an automobile and used AC Transit for all of our transportation needs."

Mark Williams, was a student when he joined the board. He had little knowledge of transit or the workings of an agency. But this is true of most elected to the board, so someone of McCalley's knowledge and experience would be a most valuable addition to the board! Williams has learned to function on the board, but with few resources of his own, he tends to follow one or two other board members. One example of this is his statement that one reason he wants to continue to serve on the board is to support "projects like the districts Hydrogen Fuel Cell Bus program." The same board member that pushed for the disastrous Van Hool buses, and still thinks they are the "best buses in the world," is trying to prod the board to continue this costly program. He has only been able to convince Young and Williams. You can view both candidates' completed questionnaires on our website, at: <http://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires/>.

AC Transit, Ward 5 Jeff Davis

Ward 5 represents Fremont, Newark and portions of Hayward. Jeff Davis had 20 years of public service in transportation at the local government level before joining the board in 2006. His replies on the questionnaire were the most succinct and showed he knew what he was talking about. On the question of the use of diesel, he said, "Zero-emission vehicles are not cost-competitive yet." He is a committed, valuable member of the board and should be re-elected.

It is hard to say much about his opponent, Kewal Singh, because he had such a disjointed response to questions. You can view both candidates' completed questionnaires on our website, at: <http://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires/>.

BART, District 4 Lena Tam, with reservations

The responses to our questionnaire from the incumbent, Robert Raburn, seem to describe many things that are happening at BART, but which are not his projects or a result of his work. In some cases, he describes them without taking credit, associating himself with them or implying he had something to do with them. In other cases, he outright takes credit for them.

Along those lines, he takes some credit for the 'Big 3' - major initiatives that were the justification given for why BART needed to extract major concessions from the Unions after they agreed to \$100 Million in concessions in the last round of negotiations with 4 years of 0 percent raises during a time when BART then experienced a massive growth in ridership, resulting in budgets that far exceeded budget projections. His answers shows that he's learned to repeat what was presented at various meetings, but leaves out major problems with the facts that were presented numerous times. For one, throughout the negotiations with the Unions, BART presented a budget that supposedly required 1000 train cars, not the 775 Director Raburn mentioned. Upon looking at the underlying numbers, the unions maintained throughout that 775 was a more realistic number and that BART was inflating its projected expenses to justify cuts in the face of apparent overwhelming surpluses. After negotiations were concluded, the BART Board of Directors voted to purchase 775 cars. Since BART's share is 25 percent of the cost, that's an estimated \$90+ Million that BART inflated its projected expenditures just with the number of train cars. The Board of Directors was willing to shut down the Bay Area when the unions and management were less than \$10 Million apart, using their numbers, which were problematic, when they actually had an extra \$90 Million at hand.

Regarding the train control system, management repeatedly stated leading up to and throughout negotiations that they needed a train control system that could handle 30 trains per hour through the transbay tube - the number

Director Raburn gave in his response. In numerous presentations, the Union pointed out that number was based on ridership growth projections that were unsustainable and ridership numbers of 750,000 (it's around 400,000 now), and that no such system existed in the world. It's anyone's guess how they managed to put a very specific price tag on something that hadn't even been invented yet, much less available on the market.

One paragraph in Raburn's response is titled "Improving Management-Labor Relations." The paragraph is notable for not mentioning his connection with any of the initiatives to improve management-labor relations. He turned down the offer of the president of the BART Board of Directors to chair the committee, and the committee has since resulted in a substantive report with 63 recommendations to provide a pathway to improve labor relations at BART. During and since negotiations, Director Raburn has maintained a solid inflexible position indistinguishable from that of the General Manager. When he describes in his response that he opposed strike contingency planning, his safety concerns for the public reflect the inability to properly prevent civil unrest around West Oakland station. He's stated the same in other discussions union members have had with him. His concerns completely miss the constant safety fears and warnings expressed by the Unions - that operating trains with untrained and uncertified managers would be dangerous on its face; operating trains is not as simple and carefree as was relayed in the press. The Union stated consistently that managers operating trains during the first strike resulted in at least five trains with flat wheels - the result of dragging a round metal wheel on a flat steel rail. This is a major potential cause of fire. Operating trains with inexperienced people who were unfamiliar with the many risks involved in operating trains, who had demonstrated while operating a small amount of trains that they could likely cause a fire, and that the main place they would operate trains would be through the transbay tube with fully loaded trains, was extremely dangerous. Director Raburn still to this day does not seem to grasp what the workers urgently expressed for months, yet still consistently echoes positions of management without objective critique.

Regarding our question #16, Director Raburn also had an ambiguous response regarding BART Board President Keller's proposal to put an anti-strike measure on the ballot. He stated opposition based on the fact that there didn't seem to be a real campaign mounted behind it. The Union was left with the impression that he would be inclined to support it if the Board were willing to put real resources behind the measure.

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

For Larry Lionel's questions related to negotiations and the relationship with management, we appreciate his short and clear answer that public sector unions should have the right to express their opinions in the form of a strike. His answers to the other two questions though showed a lack of grasp of the issues. He was honest in recognizing that he didn't know enough about the question about hiring Tom Hock, but that was a topic that was covered extensively as a major news item for much of an entire year. We would imagine someone running for such a seat would have basic knowledge of such an issue. We've heard many people we've casually met have much more of an understanding of this issue than this candidate. Similarly on the third question regarding independence of management: his example of standing up to managers shows a lack of understanding of the role of an elected director - one who is accountable to the electorate and who helps shape policy and direct management to implement such policy. Directors are not subservient to management; his example suggests the opposite.

Lena Tam is a member of the Alameda City Council, having served since 2006, and she is also a former President of the Alameda Healthcare District. She holds a Bachelor's degree in Civil/Environmental Engineering from U.C.

continued on next page

Special Districts

Berkeley and a Master's degree in Public Administration from USF. She has been involved in a number of environmental initiatives, such as Alameda's Green Building Ordinance and Climate Change Action Plan, and the Environmental Policy Committee of the League of California Cities.

Although most of Tam's questionnaire answers were not quite as detailed as the incumbent's, she does state that (regarding the proposed extension of BART to Livermore), that the "core system repairs are critical and should have a higher priority." She also believes that BART no longer needs a systems expansion department.

Tam's answers to our questions #16 - 18, regarding labor and management, are concise, and are consistent with her actions in the past. Her answer to #16 regarding the right to strike seems more solid and based on a conclusion that she's thought about. Her answer to #17 hits the nail on the head regarding the Board - that they need to act as directors and lead, rather than sitting by and handing the reins to a management that is known for poor labor relations. This is the key recommendation by the consultant for the Board.

One of the reasons we are supporting Tam is the strong support by unions she's had to deal with in other elected positions and their description of how she was willing to take a position independent of management during stalled labor negotiations. In fact, many union members will be volunteering and campaigning for her based on their experience of her willingness not to be a rubber stamp for management. The main author of the consultant report stated BART ranked in her top 5 of dysfunctional organizations when it came to how they handled labor relations. BART very much needs a director who will be attentive to what

management is doing and be willing to provide direction. However, because Tam has been overly-supportive of developers while serving on the Alameda City Council, we have decided to give her an endorsement "with reservations." Vote for Lena Tam.

East Bay Regional Park District, Ward 5 No Endorsement

Unfortunately, for the third time in a row there is no candidate for this park district board seat whose record and positions merit Green Party endorsement. Ayn Wieskamp, from Livermore, is the current board president and incumbent for Ward 5, which encompasses Brightside, Dublin, part of Fremont, Livermore, Newark, Pleasanton, and Sunol. She declined to return the Green Party questionnaire but sent a copy of answers she had provided to a questionnaire for another organization. That questionnaire did not address a number of issues covered on the Green Party questionnaire, including the district's use of pesticides, the hazard to raptors from wind turbines on park district land at Altamont Pass, the lack of transparency in the activities of the Regional Parks Foundation, and the district's difficult labor negotiations with employees last year.

Among Wieskamp's responses were a number of vague and general comments that were not elaborated, such as "All [EBPRD's] land use plans carefully study environmental issues and how to protect the environment of each project." The only glimmers of ecological wisdom and social justice in her comments were her opposition to allowing off-road

vehicles in Tesla Park and her mention of access to parks for those with disabilities.

Dev Gandhi is challenging Wieskamp for the Ward 5 seat. He returned the Green questionnaire, citing his experience during the past 20 years in "high-tech entrepreneurialism and wireless carrier operations with experience in developing and marketing mobile & online software, advertising and media technology" as his primary qualifications. His answers to the questionnaire were vague and general, for example: "I would like the opportunity to advocate for more open space to provide recreational opportunities for our growing communities so we have adequate open spaces for people to enjoy for the next century."

A repeated theme in his comments was the need to "balance the available open spaces with the community demand so we can preserve our parks & habitats for future generations." Although the precise meaning of this intent was not clear, it seems to mean limiting the usage of parks in accord with their perceived capacity: "We have to control park recreation to balance with what is sustainable to keep native habitats healthy."

Neither candidate mentioned the district's ongoing use of pesticides in its integrated pest management program, nor did either candidate mention the proposed use of large amounts of herbicide and removal of large numbers of trees in commenting on EBRPD's "wildland-urban interface" Federal Emergency Management Agency project.

In our write-up on the 2006 race for this seat, we concluded, "Sadly, it's going to take at least four years before we might have a worthy candidate for this seat". (The seat was uncontested 4 years later in 2010). Sadly, we draw the same conclusion in 2014.

Peralta Community College Board

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 has ultimate responsibility for watching over the Peralta District Office and its four colleges.

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

Peralta Board, Area 7 Julina Bonilla

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

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

Richard Fuentes (richardfuentes.com/) ran for an Oakland School Board seat unsuccessfully in 2012. We

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

Peralta Board, Area 5 David Ralston

Area 5 includes Piedmont and portions of Oakland, including Grand Lake, Upper Rockridge, Glenview, Laurel, and the area between Hwy 580 and Skyline to Leona Canyon. William Riley (riley4trustee.com/), incumbent and senior member of the Peralta Board, was first elected in 1998. He ran unopposed in 2002 and 2006. We have not endorsed him in the past and cannot endorse him now. His 4 terms (16 years) have been undistinguished. His responses to our questionnaire were perfunctory. Riley is a retired school administrator and has a pattern of deferring to Peralta administration, no matter the caliber. For example, former Oakland mayor Elihu Harris was Peralta Chancellor from 2003-2010 and, among other problems, Harris presided over a disastrous rollout of a new computer system that was so deficient the district had significant audit findings for several years that led to the colleges accreditation being threatened. Despite that, Harris received a nice boost in base salary which allowed him to retire with a CalPERS pension of over \$200,000 per year. In the meantime Part Time faculty struggle with low salaries, no job security and minimal benefits. It's time to remove the vestiges of cronyism and get new blood on the Peralta Board.

Environmental planner David Ralston is challenging Riley. Ralston has taught as a part-time instructor

at Merritt College and lecturer at San Jose State and UC Berkeley. His response to our question about part-time/contingent faculty was detailed and represents understanding of the issues facing over 2/3 of the faculty in the PCCD district. Ralston also had an intriguing suggestion that a two-thirds vote of the Board would be necessary to override key policy decisions supported by shared governance bodies.

We are pleased to see an attempt to unseat the incumbent, though we wish that Ralston had made his intention to run clear to potential supporters much earlier. Even in September, the website addresses he gave us (ralstonforperalta.com, Ralstonforperaltabd.org) were not functioning. [Later, after the paper Voter Guides were published, he gave us the correct URL: <http://www.dralstonforperaltabd.org/>.] That said, we encourage a vote for Ralston because he would bring a fresh perspective and creative ideas to change the status quo in Peralta.

 **HELP WANTED**
...to build the Green Party!

**FOR OUR
NEXT VOTER GUIDE**

Writing **Election Analysis**
 Phone Calls **Distribution**

For this current issue, we were significantly short of volunteers to help with writing, and various other tasks, so we're definitely going to need more help to produce our next issue!

Even though the next election won't take place for about 19 months, please contact us now, while you're thinking about this!

The Green Party needs your help in order for us to grow!

**If you can help with any of the above tasks, please contact us at:
(510) 644-2293 or
acgreens2012@gmail.com**

Read the CANDIDATES' QUESTIONNAIRES Online

For the special district races, all of the candidates returned our questionnaires, and for the city races in Alameda, Emeryville, and Oakland, almost all of them did so. You'll find lots of additional info in the candidates' completed questionnaires, so we strongly encourage you to read them on our website: <http://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires/> (Or, you can simply go to: acgreens.org, and then click on the "Candidate Questionnaires" tab near the top of the page).

State Propositions

Prop. 1

continued from page 1

vember's ballot means that some of the organizations who have the most thorough analysis have not had time to re-examine this version. So we looked at what, for example, the Pacific Institute said when they looked at the larger version in 2010. They compared the proposed bonds to earlier bonds and found an important difference. Large water projects of the past, such as the State Water Project in 1960, provided that almost all the repayment funds would come from those who used the water (including the agribusinesses of the San Joaquin Valley). But the current proposed bond will have repayments coming from the General Fund.

Many Californians are concerned about whether this water bond will help Governor Brown get his "enormous tunnels" project built, the project he doesn't want to bring before the voters. In an article in Daily Kos (8/14/14), Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla, Restore the Delta Executive Director, disagreed [with Governor Brown] that the bond is "tunnels neutral." She responded to the passage of the bill by stating, "The passage of a water bond with BDCP funds for flows is unfortunate."

"Instead of focusing on making California's water use more efficient, fixing our aging and leaking water system and cleaning up our groundwater, Proposition 1 instead focuses on building more dams, at a cost of \$2.7 billion dollars plus interest. These dams will only increase California's water supply by 1 percent and won't be usable for decades." This begins the "Rebuttal to Argument in Favor" from the Official Supplemental Voter Information Guide" still in its 20-day Public Display Period as of this writing. [Aug. 23- Sept. 12] Opponents of Proposition 1 include Assemblymember Wesley Chesbro, Chair, Natural Resources Committee; Adam Scow, California Director, Food & Water Watch; Zeke Grader, Executive Director, Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations; Conner Everts, Executive Director, Southern California Watershed Alliance; and Barbara Barrigan-Parilla, Executive Director, Restore the Delta. Please join us in voting NO on Proposition 1.

Proposition 2 - NO State Reserve Policy ('Rainy Day' Fund)

This proposition has significant implications for future state budgets; the recent discussion/debate in the state legislature on restoring cuts prefigures other political conflicts not simply amongst legislators, but more importantly, with significant working class constituencies and their organizations as to resources.

The background to this proposed amendment to the state constitution was the passage of Prop 58 in 2004, which established a new reserve fund (BSA - Budget Stabilization Account) which requires the governor annually to consider putting up to 3 percent of the General Fund revenues in this reserve. This is considered the basic amount and is currently at \$3 billion; the measure called for a maximum of \$8 billion. Money can be removed from the BSA by a majority vote of the legislature and there is no limit on the amount.

Prop 44 would significantly alter this in the following ways: 1) It would require the state to pay down specified debts by a minimum amount of \$800 million annually for at least 15 years; 2) It would require the state to contribute a minimum of another \$800 million annually to the BSA, up to \$2 billion (depending on capital gains revenues); 3) Money could only be removed if the governor declared a "budget emergency" and it was approved by the legislature; the amount removed could be no more than half the BSA, based on the projection of the "budget emergency" (and with no "budget emergency" the previous year); and 4) Money would go into a state reserve for public schools and community colleges, in years when capital gains income was strong; further, it would limit the reserves that school districts could hold.

What does this really mean? Many people might be tempted to vote for this measure on the basis on "financial stability" and the impact of state debt. There are some positive features, connecting contributions to capital gains taxes (but no language to increase them), while the language about limiting school district reserves would be welcome, since they are often used as an excuse to avoid negotiating more funds for staff and programs (however, this could be done in a separate law).

In reality, this measure only demonstrates Jerry Brown's ongoing commitment to a neo-liberal agenda. Much as with the national debate, the emphasis is placed on bringing down the debt, versus meeting the needs of working Californians, especially the poorest sectors (often females and/or people of color). As mentioned this was already demonstrated in Sacramento during the most recent budget cycle, despite

the added revenues with the passage of Prop 30. It gives whomever is governor much greater powers (declaring the "budget emergency") and for 15 years, block efforts to alter priorities.

This austerity proposition should be opposed and used as a basis to explain why such fiscal reactionary (not responsibility) policy would be disastrous for working people in California and why we must insist the answer is making the rich and corporations pay (including advocating debt cancellation).

Proposition 45 - YES Health Insurance Rate Changes

Before commenting on Prop. 45, voters should know that Green Party members are advocates for an Improved Medicare for All – minus the insurance industry. We are working to achieve a comprehensive, coordinated and cost-effective insurance plan that pays for healthcare from one non-profit fund. In other countries with their versions of Medicare for All, the cost for healthcare is far lower than we pay and, they get better quality care. That said, we encourage you to vote yes on Prop. 45.

In 1988, voters approved Prop. 103 which allowed the California Insurance Commissioner to review and approve proposed auto and homeowner insurance rates before they take effect. Currently, the Insurance Commissioner is able to review proposed health insurance rates but has no authority to reject or approve rates. Prop. 45 gives the Commissioner that authority.

According to analysis by the Legislative Analyst, Prop. 45 "mainly applies to individual and small group health insurance—which covers roughly 6 million Californians or 16 percent of the population".

Proponents claim that drivers have saved more than \$102 Billion since Prop. 103 was passed and that Prop. 45 will save Californians \$200 million or more per year. They also note that 36 of 50 states have the authority to control health insurance rate hikes.

Opponents say that Prop. 45 gives one politician too much power and will create more costly bureaucracy. Proponents state that California's big health insurance companies have already contributed more than \$25 million to defeat Prop. 45. Considering the projected consumer savings of \$200 million per year, there may be much more contributed to the No on 45 campaign before November.

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

Proposition 46 - NO Drug Testing of Doctors and Medical Negligence Lawsuits

Trial lawyers want to raise the current state \$250,000 limit (instituted in 1975) on "pain and suffering" damages that can be assessed in medical negligence lawsuits to \$1.1 million, to keep up with inflation.

Prop 46 adds two arguably peripheral measures, in theory to improve the quality of health care: a) drug and alcohol testing of doctors and reporting of positive tests to the California Medical Board, and b) requiring health care practitioners to consult a state prescription drug history database before prescribing certain controlled substances.

Supporters include Consumer Attorneys of California, Consumer Watchdog, and Senator Boxer. Opponents include physician groups, led by the California Medical Association, insurers, hospitals, allied health professionals, most labor unions, the ACLU, the Chamber of Commerce, the NAACP, and the CA School Boards Assoc. CA Dems and California Nurses' Association are staying neutral.

Greens could argue either side of the payment issue. Our broken health care system does need to address patient safety and compensate those who have been harmed. But will payouts, and the resulting rise in malpractice insurance, drive medical care costs even further out of reach? The Congressional Budget Office says it will not significantly raise costs, but a coalition of medical clinics say it will.

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

However, the third section to this omnibus bill is the most worrisome, and it isn't even reflected in the proposi-

tion's title. It would REQUIRE health care practitioners to consult a state-level proprietary-software prescription drug history database before prescribing certain controlled substances (DEA Schedule II and III). The database already exists, but it is not required to be used (currently only 8 percent of MD's do it).

The intent of this section is to keep people from getting quantities of the same or similar drugs (painkillers, diet aids, psychological aids, steroids) from doctors who are not aware the person has already obtained such drugs elsewhere. Even if a voter applauds this (debatable) goal, the implementation is unworkable and even frightening. For example, .. this requirement could make it impossible to get honestly-needed drugs when the database is down. Since only 8 percent of MD's voluntarily do it now, that means a more than ten times traffic increase on this web-based system, which is likely to cause crashes.

.. what is considered a controlled substance is open to political manipulation over time. This law would thus take personal control even further away from individuals.

.. your entire prescription drug history will be in this web-based database for all the world to see, if it gets hacked. People who might be looking for something to use against you (reporters, custody lawyers, job background checkers, Big Brother) could find a way to get access. There was already a lawsuit about privacy concerns around this database, and the patient apparently lost.

This bill should have been three separate propositions. Again, what we need is Improved Medicare for All (Single Payer) Now. Vote NO.

Proposition 47 - YES with great embarrassment and disappointment because much more needs to be done Criminal Sentences, Misdemeanors Penalties

Proposition 47, the Criminal Sentences, Misdemeanor Penalties Initiative Statute, demonstrates the intellectual-poverty and limpness of the public debate over criminal justice policy. It does not confront the almost total failure and tragedy-making of California's prison and jail system. When we use the amount of public dollars tied up in the system as a measure, the arguments for or against Proposition 47 concern only about 3 percent of the nine (9) billion dollar cost. Of the 220,000 annual felony convictions, the sentencing of maybe 5 percent will be changed by passage of this initiative. Every life is important and every dollar is precious but Proposition 47 brings this State essentially no closer to ending the horrendous waste of lives and resources that is the California criminal justice system.

The initiative was written by the District Attorney of San Francisco, a former Assistant Police Chief for the Los Angeles Police Department, a former Chief of Police for San Francisco, and the former Chief of Police for the cities of San Diego, San Jose, and Richmond. The Chiefs were joined by a survivor, crime victims' advocate, and widow of a San Leandro police officer killed in the line of duty. All of Us or None members helped gather signatures for Prop 47.

The opposition is composed of the California Coalition Against Sexual Assault, California District Attorneys Association, California Fraternal Order of Police, California Peace Officers Association, California Police Chiefs Association, California Retailers Association, California State Sheriffs' Association, Crime Victim Action Alliance, and Crime Victims United of California. Great appreciation must be expressed to the proponents for standing against this "wall" of status quo benefactors and supporters. Despite the very limited nature of Proposition 47 the scare tactics put forward by this opposition will be just as loud as it will be untrue.

The initiative converts six crimes considered "wobblers," non-violent crimes that can be charged as either felonies or misdemeanors, into misdemeanor-specific charges. It could reduce sentences for numerous incarcerated people and potentially result in the release of thousands of people from prison. Additionally, this initiative would redirect money previously spent on prisons to other services: 25 percent for grants aimed at reducing truancy and drop-outs among K-12 students, 10 percent for victim services grants, and 65 percent to support mental health and drug abuse treatment services that are designed to help keep individuals out of prison and jail. The initiative is inapplicable to persons with prior conviction for serious or violent crime and registered sex offenders. It does not prevent judges from felony sentencing of those who steal a hand gun valued at less than \$950, the property crime cut off point. The Sen-

State Propositions, State and Federal Offices

tencing Project recently reported that the budget-forced and/or court-forced prison population reductions have resulted in crime rate declines faster than the national average rather than the increases the opposition predicts.

In the last 30 years California has built 22 new prisons but only one university. This tragic waste of our resources has to stop. Proposition 47 is a tiny step in the right direction. It is just not enough.

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

This proposition concerns some Indian gaming compacts which would allow a large casino to be built about 4 miles north of the City of Madera -- and NOT on the tribe's reservation. Last year the state legislature barely approved a bill (AB 277) which allowed this project to move forward. (Only 41 out of 80 Assemblymembers voted for it, and only 22 out of 40 State Senators voted for it). After Governor Brown signed the bill, a referendum campaign ensued to overturn the bill, to prevent this casino from being built, and because the referendum qualified for the ballot, it is now before us, the voters. Under California law, a "Yes" vote on a referendum allows the original legislation to remain in force, and a "No" vote overturns that legislation. Therefore, voting "Yes" on Prop. 48 allows this casino to be built, and voting "No" on Prop. 48 prevents the casino from being built.

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

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

State Superintendent of Public Instruction Don't vote for Tuck

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

Tom Torlakson is the current office holder and is one of the main representatives of the so-called 'labor Democrats'. He is heavily backed by the two main educator unions, the California Teachers Association and the California Federation of Teachers, as well as the state AFL-CIO. While in many cases this is not a factor to consider support, the assault on public education makes consideration for Torlakson a factor, especially with no left alternative. He opposes the testing regime (at least in opposition to the federal guidelines, for which there is currently a moratorium in California) and the expansion of charter schools. Also important is the state position in opposition in the Vergara case which would undermine seniority and due process for 275,000 teachers in the state.

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

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

U.S. Representative, District 13 Boycott this race

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

To date (August 7, 2014), incumbent Democrat Barbara Lee has raised \$840,085 between her primary and general election campaign periods. Of that, \$292,460 has been spent on "Fundraising Consultants," in addition, she has \$5,250 listed as a campaign expense for Mad Max Sailing Adventures, Martha's Vineyard, MA. The total expenses for the two parties (one in 2013, the other 2014) listed on her FEC filings is \$18,393.

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

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

She has collected money from some big corporations, some of whom are big defense contractors, including Lockheed Martin and General Electric. There's only one big corporate donation from her own district, and that's from Clorox (\$4,000).

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

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

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

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

State Assembly District 15 Don't vote for Echols

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

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

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

** GO PAPERLESS **

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

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

Thanks everyone!

East Bay Computer Services

374 40th Street, Oakland, CA 94609

www.eastbaycomputerservices.com

In Temescal between MacArthur BART and Piedmont Ave / Broadway area

Small office networking services Microsoft Small Business Partners



- Servers
- Backup and data recovery
- Virus removal
- Upgrades
- Laptops and desktops
- Mac and Linux
- Onsite service

Call (510) 645-1800

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



PRESORTED
 STANDARD
 U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
 CPS

Read the CANDIDATES' QUESTIONNAIRES: See the Box on Page 9 • Go PAPERLESS!: See the Front Page Box

Green Voter Card

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

State Executive Offices

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

Federal Offices

U.S. Representative, District 13 - See write-up, boycott this race

Other State Offices

State Board of Equalization, District 2 - Boycott this race; see front-page article
 State Assembly, District 15 - [Don't vote for Echols]
 State Assembly, District 18 - Boycott this race; see front-page article

Judicial Offices

State Supreme Court - Vote Yes on Mariano Cuelлар, Goodwin Liu, and
 Kathryn Werdegar, with reservations
 State Courts of Appeal, First District - No Endorsements, see write-up

Special School Districts

Peralta Community College, Area 5 - David Ralston
 Peralta Community College, Area 7 - Juliana Bonilla
County Offices
 Superintendent of Schools - [Don't vote for Foster]

City Offices

Alameda
 Mayor - Trish Spencer
 City Council - Frank Matarrese
 School Board - Solana Henneberrry and Gary Lym
 Healthcare District - No Endorsement, see Questionnaires

Albany

City Council Cancellation Response - See article
 School Board - Charles Blanchard and Paul Black;
 Ross Stapleton-Gray, with reservations

Berkeley

Auditor - No Endorsement, see write-up
 City Council, District 1 - Alejandro Soto-Vigil
 City Council, District 4 - Jesse Arraguin
 City Council, District 7 - Kriss Worthington
 City Council, District 8 - #1: Jacquelyn McCormick; sharing #2 & #3:
 George Beier* and Lori Droste*; [Stop Alvarez-Cohen]
 School Board - Ty Alper, Josh Daniels, and Karen Hemphill
 Rent Board - Katherine Harr, John Selawsky, Paola Laverde-Levine, James
 Chang, and Jesse Townley

Emeryville

City Council - John Bauters & Scott Donahue; Dianne Martinez, with
 reservations
 School Board - Christian Patz

Oakland

Mayor - #1: Jason Anderson, #2: Saied Karamooz*, #3: Dan Siegel*
 *These candidates have been ranked, but not endorsed.

Auditor - No Endorsement, see write-up

City Council, District 2 - [Don't vote for King or Maxey]
 City Council, District 4 - [Don't vote for vote Broadhurst or Lim]
 City Council, District 6 - #1: Write in Vicente Cruz; [Don't vote for Johnson
 or Moore]

School Board, District 2 - No Endorsement, see write-up
 School Board, District 4 - Karl Debro, with reservations; [Don't vote for
 Shakir-Gilmore]

School Board, District 6 - Shanthi Gonzales

Special Districts

A.C. Transit, At-Large - Dolene Jones, with reservations
 A.C. Transit, Ward 4 - Murphy McCalley
 A.C. Transit, Ward 5 - Jeff Davis
 BART, District 4 - Lena Tam, with reservations
 EBRPD, Ward 3 - Marguerite Young
 EBRPD, Ward 5 - No Endorsement, see write-up

State Propositions

1 - Water Bond - No
 2 - State Reserve Policy (Rainy Day Fund) - No
 45 - Healthcare Insurance Rate Changes - Yes
 46 - Drug Testing of Doctors; Medical Negligence Lawsuits - No
 47 - Criminal Sentences, Misdemeanor Penalties - Yes, but much more needs
 to be done
 48 - Indian Gaming Referendum - No (Don't approve the compacts)

Local Measures

D - Berkeley vs. Big Soda - Yes
 F - Berkeley Parks Tax - See Write-up: Either vote No in Protest OR
 Abstain from Voting
 I - Alameda \$179 Million School Bond - No
 K - Emeryville School Parcel Tax Renewal - Yes, with reservations
 N - Oakland School Parcel Tax - No Endorsement, see write-up
 O - Berkeley Recall of Elective Officers - Yes
 P - Berkeley Towards reversing Citizens United v FEC, corporate personhood,
 and money being equated with speech - Yes
 Q - Berkeley Flex-time Initiative - Yes
 R - Berkeley Green Downtown and Public Commons Initiative - Yes
 S - Berkeley Redistricting Gerrymander - No
 U - Emeryville Becoming a Charter City - Yes
 V - Emeryville Property Transfer Tax - Yes
 Z - Oakland Police & Services Parking & Parcel Tax - No
 BB - County Transportation Expenditure Plan - Yes
 CC - Oakland Public Ethics Commission - Yes, with reservations
 DD - Oakland Independent Redistricting Commission -- No
 EE - Oakland Municipal Retirement System termination- Yes
 FF - Oakland Minimum Wage Increase - Yes, Yes, Yes!
 LL - Albany School Parcel Tax - Yes, with reservations
 Candidates in green ink are Green Party members

Green Voter Guide

A publication of the Green Party of Alameda County,
 an affiliate of the Green Party of California.

Alameda • Albany • Berkeley • Dublin • Emeryville • Fremont
 Hayward • Livermore • Newark • Oakland • Piedmont
 Pleasanton • San Leandro
 Union City

Index	
Statewide Offices	1, 15
State Assembly, Federal Offices	15
State Propositions	1, 14, 15
Judicial Offices	11
Special Districts	1, 12, 13
County Offices and Measures	11
City Offices and Measures	
Alameda	1, 3
Albany	3, 4
Berkeley	1, 4, 5, 6
Emeryville	7
Oakland	1, 8, 9, 10
Voter Card	Back page

November 4, 2014

