

Fred Werner's Bay Area Voter Guide RESULTS **Green = won**, **Red = lost**, **Yellow = 2nd choice won**.



2024 - General Election Cheat Sheet. Click links or scroll down for detailed info on each.

Register to vote: online by Oct. 21st, or in-person anytime up to election day.

Mail in your ballot, or drop it off, or [vote in person](#), all by **TUESDAY Nov. 5**.

California propositions:

2 - School bond - **YES**
3 - Same-sex marriage - **YES**
4 - Climate bond - **YES**
5 - 55% voting for housing - **YES**
6 - End slavery - **YES!!!**
32 - Minimum wage - **YES**
33 - Local rent control - **YES!**
34 - Patient spending - **NO**
35 - Health care tax - **yes**
36 - Criminal penalties - **NO!!!**

Berkeley

W - real estate transfer tax - **YES**
X - tax for the library - **YES**
Y - tax for parks + trees - **Yes**
Z - soda tax permanent - **YES**
AA - ↑ spending limit - **YES**
BB - housing retention - **YES**
CC - fund some rent - **NO**
DD - ban livestock - **YES**
EE - streets & sidewalks - **NO!**
FF - streets & sidewalks - **YES!**
GG - natural gas tax - **no**
HH - indoor air quality - **NO**

Oakland

NN - violence prevention. - **YES**
OO - public ethics - **YES**
MM - wildfire zone tax - **YES**

Hayward

K1: 0.5% sales tax - **YES**

Albany

L - school bond - **YES**
C - sidewalks & paths - **YES**
R - rental assistance - **YES**
S - appoint officers - **yes**
T - bond before duty - **yes**
U - school bond limit - **yes**
V - 16-year-olds vote - **YES!!!**

Contra Costa County:

G - El Cerrito Sales Tax - **YES**
J - Richmond - non-partisan
municipal primaries - **NO**
L - Richmond - Ranked Choice
Voting - **YES!!!**

Marin County:

I - Fairfax end rent control - **NO**
N-San Anselmo rent control-**Yes**

Sonoma County:

J - Ban factory farms - **YES!!**
O - Healdsburg housing - **Yes**
U - Sebastopol sales tax - **yes**
(only 3k voters?!)
Y - Petaluma urban update **Yes**

San Francisco:

A - Schools - **Yes**
B - Health & Safety - **Yes**
C - Inspector General - **Yes**
D - Commissions - **No!**
E - Commission Task Force-**Yes**
F - Police Staffing - **no**
G - Affordable Housing - **YES**
H - Firefighters Benefits - **yes**
I - Nurses & 911 Benefits - **yes**
J - Youth & Families - **yes**
K - Close Great Highway- **YES**
L - Uber/Lyft Tax - **YES!!!**
M - Business Tax Update - **Yes**
N - 1st Responders - **no**
O - Reproductive Rights - **YES!**

CANDIDATES

US President & Vice President: **Kamala Harris + Tim Walz** or 3rd party in safe blue California.

US Senator: **Adam Schiff** (although disappointed neither of the female candidates we liked made it)

Note that district #s have changed for US Congress, State Assembly, and State Senate. [Look yours up](#).

US Representative CA-12: **Lateefah Simon** CA-15-14: **Eric Swalwell**

CA-8: **John Garamendi**

CA-10: **Mark DeSaulnier**

CA-17: **Ro Khanna**

State Senator District #7: **Jovanka Beckles** District #9: **Marisol Rubio (D)** District #5: **Jerry McNerney**

State Assembly District 14: **Margot Smith** (not Buffy Wicks)

District 15: **Anamarie Avila Farias**

District 16: **Rebecca Bauer-Kahan**

District 18: **Mia Bonta**

District 20: **Liz Ortega**

Alameda County Board of Supervisors District #5: **Nikki Fortunato Bas**

Oakland Recall Attempts: No on both Recall District Attorney (Pamela Price) - **NO!**
Recall Mayor (Sheng Thao) - **NO!**

AC Transit Ward 6: **Jesse Gunn**

BART Director District 5: Melissa Hernández
District 7: Victor Flores District 9: Edward Wright

East Bay Regional Park District Director
Ward 2: **Lynda Deschambault** Ward 4: Luana Espana

East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) - District 1: Joey Smith. District 5: Jim Oddie
District 6: Valerie Lewis

Alameda County Water District (ACWD) - Ward 5: Aziz Akbari

Oakland City Council At-Large: #1: **Charlene Wang**; #2: Rowena Brown
District 1: #1: Zac Unger; #2: Edward Frank District 3: **Carroll Fife**
District 5: Erin Armstrong District 7: #1: Iris Merriouns; #2: Merika Goolsby

Oakland School Board District 1: Rachel Latta District 3: VanCedric Williams
District 5: Sasha Ritzie-Hernandez District 7: **Domonic Ware**

Oakland City Attorney: Ryan Richardson

Peralta Community College District, Area 2 (East Oakland): Paulina Gonzalez-Brito

Berkeley Mayor: #1: Adena Ishii; #2: Sophie Hahn (AC Greens & OREB say Harrison)

Berkeley City Council District 2: Jenny Guarino
District 3: #1- John "Chip" Moore; 2-Ben Bartlett District 5: Nilang Gor District 6: Andy Katz

Berkeley School Board: **Ana Vasudeo and Jen Corn**

Berkeley Rent Stabilization Board: **Xavier Johnson**, **Alfred Twu**, **Avery Arbaugh** and **Dominique Walker**

Alameda City Council: Michelle Pryor

Albany City Council: #1 Peggy McQuaid; #2 Aaron Tiedemann; #3 Preston Jordan; #4: Jeremiah Garrett-Pinguelo; #5) Jennifer Hansen-Romero

Albany School Board: Jolene Gazman, #2: Brian Doss

Hayward City Council:

Hayward School Board: Austin Bruckner-Carrillo

Chabot-Las Positas CC Board Area 1:- Area 4: Maria Heredia

Contra Costa County Board of Education Area 1: Anthony Caro

El Cerrito City Council (pick 3): **Rebecca Saltzman**, **Lisa Motoyama**, **Courtney Helion**

[Richmond City Council](#)

District 1: Melvin Willis

District 5: Ahmad Anderson

District 6: Claudia Jimenez

[San Francisco Mayor](#): Aaron Peskin

[SF Board of Supervisors](#):

District 1: Connie Chan

District 3: Sharon Lai

District 5: Dean Preston

District 7: Myrna Melgar

District 9: Jackie Fielder (rank as #2: Stephen Torres)

District 11: Chyanne Chen (#2 = Ernest Jones)

Info and suggestions for all the candidates/questions on the Nov. 5, 2024 ballot

To learn about EVERYTHING on YOUR ballot (incl. all local candidates & questions)

[Wevote.us](#)

[Vote411](#)

https://ballotpedia.org/Sample_Ballot_Lookup

Steven Tavares' fairly complete [list of all candidates and ballot measures in the East Bay](#)

Good comprehensive voter guides including local candidates/questions:

- [Our Revolution East Bay](#)
- [Wellstone Democratic Renewal Club](#)
- [SF Berniecrats endorsements](#)
- [Green Party of Alameda County Voter Guide](#) and the [AC Greens voter card](#)" (cheatsheet)
- [SF Chronicle / SFGATE](#)
- [Cal Matters](#)
- [Courage California](#)
- [Oakland Rising](#)
- [Bay Rising](#)

Other good local voter guides:

[KQED](#)

[Oaklandside](#)

[Berkeleyside](#)

[SPUR](#)

Oaklandside also has a great [compendium of voter guides for Oakland, the East Bay and the Bay Area](#).

California Online Voter Registration: Check your county elections website for info and instructions:

- Alameda: <https://www.acvote.org/crossover.page>
- Contra Costa: <https://www.contracostavote.gov/request-a-crossover-ballot/>
- SF: <https://sfelections.org/tools/portal/>
- Marin: <https://www.marincounty.org/depts/rv>

This is a Google Doc. Feel free to share and PLEASE comment on it (click on a section you want to comment on, then click Insert => Comment), especially if something seems missing or if you have an additional resource or perspective to share .

Shorter version of the link to this doc: <https://shorturl.at/IOheI>

Detailed descriptions of Ballot Questions

I. California State Ballot Questions

PROP 2 - School bond - YES

From KQED: \$8.5 billion for the state's elementary, secondary and charter schools — and \$1.5 billion for community colleges — to build more facilities or fix old ones. And while the state typically matches half the cost of a district's new construction projects and 60% of its renovation projects, under this plan it would provide a higher match for lower-resourced school districts. The state would also give schools extra funding to reduce lead levels in water and provide the appropriate facilities for transitional kindergarten as the state expands this grade level.

PROP 3 - Same-sex marriage - YES

Codifies the acceptance of same-sex marriage into the California State Assembly. Long overdue opportunity for California voters to correct the mistake we made in 2008 (a mistake which even the US Supreme Court undid before we had a chance to fix).

Endorsed by most progressive groups. SF Berniecrats is "Hell Yes!!!" on Prop 3.

PROP 4 - Climate bond - YES

From KQED: \$10b for climate projects: \$3.8 billion for safe drinking water, drought, flood and water resilience programs; \$1.5 billion for wildfire prevention and restoring the health of forests; and \$1.2 billion to increase coastal resiliency and mitigate sea level rise. Other funds would address extreme heat, create nature-based solutions, fight air pollution, etc. It also requires that at least 40% of the funds be used for projects that benefit disadvantaged communities.

Prop 4 is real money towards real solutions to help mitigate climate change. It's endorsed by most environmental groups, including locally by the Golden Gate Bird Alliance.

AC Greens recommends voting no because they say it's an insufficient patch to cover up only part of \$10 billion that the state legislature cut in climate funding. For example, the budget cut reduced state spending on clean transportation, and there's no transportation \$ in Prop 4. And also because Prop 4 is a regressive general bond, rather than making oil companies (or at least wealthy tax payers + corp.s) foot the bill.

We agree that bonds are a less desirable way to fund desirable projects or services. But even if AC Greens assessment of the motivation for Prop 4 is correct, it's hard to see how a No vote helps address our climate crisis, nor how its failure would take the Legislature to task for cutting the climate budget or failing to take more progressive action.

If Prop 4 fails, would that spur more climate action by the Assembly and State Senate? Seems more likely that it would take things in the opposition direction, presented as showing a lack of voter appetite for expensive climate solutions.

A vote for Prop 4 seems like a vote for taking some strides, however insufficient, toward climate sanity, and a vote of confidence in the overall concept of getting our govt to do more about it.

PROP 5 - Voting threshold for local bonds for affordable housing and infrastructure - YES

From KQED: Currently, any local bond measure must be approved by a two-thirds supermajority of voters. Prop 5 would reduce that threshold to 55% for bonds that fund affordable housing or public infrastructure projects.

Empower local governments to address priorities without having to wait for state and federal funding. Also level the playing field with school districts, which can pass bonds to fund school upgrades with only 55% of the vote. (2000 ballot measure)

But: “infrastructure projects” is vague and could apply to anything. Prop 5 could allow massive tax hikes, because bonds are paid for by increased property taxes. If Proposition 5 passes, politicians could pass bond measures more easily, further hiking taxes for property owners.

Also, why encourage more bond measures when they are a costly way to fund projects?

Supported by non-profit housing advocates, Dems, unions

Opposed by realtors, Howard Jarvis, Chamber of Commerce

[Top](#)

PROP 6 - End involuntary servitude in CA constitution. Vote against slavery - YES!

The CA constitution, like the 13th Amendment, has an exception that allows for forced labor as punishment for a crime. This means that folks in CA jails and prisons can be forced to work – e.g. cleaning facilities, working for corporations, fighting CA fires – for \$1 a day – and penalized if they instead would rather pursue education, drug treatment, or other programming. Proposition 6 would:

- Change the California constitution to prohibit slavery and involuntary servitude in any form.
- Prohibit the prison system from disciplining any incarcerated person for declining a work assignment. Still allows for a voluntary work program.
- Give incarcerated people more flexibility to engage in rehabilitative programs like education, emotional intelligence courses, mental health and substance use treatment, which can reduce recidivism and support successful reentry.
- Prevent incarcerated people from being disciplined for choosing rehabilitative activities over a work assignment.

SF Berniecrats is “Hell Yes!!!” on Prop 6

[Top](#)

PROP 32 - Minimum wage - YES

raise the state's minimum wage to \$18 per hour by 2026.

From the [Courage Campaign](#):

In 2016, the California state legislature passed SB 3 to raise the minimum wage to \$15 per hour by 2023, and mandated adjustments for inflation tied to the Consumer Price Index (CPI). SB 3 also established unique timelines for businesses to provide wage increases based on the number of people employed. Proposition 32 would follow a similar format to continue to increase the statewide minimum wage to \$18 per hour by 2026, with a required CPI-based increase after \$18/hour has been reached. The proposition also includes a provision that would allow the governor to delay the increases up to two times in response to an unexpected economic downturn.

PROP 33 - Local rent control - YES

Repeal Costa Hawkins, which prohibits California cities and towns from instituting rent control, even if they want to.

Prop 33 will repeal "Costa Hawkins" which is a long-standing state law that prohibits cities and counties from setting or updating any local rent-control laws. Prop 33 will take off those handcuffs and let municipalities decide.

Concerns about Prop 33 having a chilling effect on new housing construction are overblow. There are enough state laws (and local activism) promoting new housing even in NIMBY jurisdictions, so rent control is unlikely to limit or restrict new housing construction in any meaningful way. In fact, the rate of new market-rate housing construction and skyrocketing costs are all additional arguments for expanding access for tenants to rent control, which Prop 33 would do.

The bigger issue here is why anyone thinks it's helpful for the state to dictate to every single local jurisdiction that they can't have rent control if they didn't already institute it decades ago. It's not. Repeal Costa Hawkins. Vote yes on 33.

My mother-in-law lived in a small ~1200 sq. ft. single family home here in Berkeley. Until the landlord began dramatically increasing the rent, ~10% per year, trying to catch up to market rate. My mother-in-law is on a fixed-income pension with a small retirement savings, and it quickly became apparent that she could no longer afford to live in her home. So she had to move.

If we have to choose between the right of landlords (even small-scale individuals like hers), to maximize their rate of return, vs. the right of residents to not get priced out of their homes, I'm

with the latter. Rent control is designed to protect renters from global investment patterns that can influence "market rate" as much as inflation or even local supply-demand.

Rent control allows for increases, of course. Our rent is ~50% more now than when we moved in 15 years ago. That should cover general maintenance, inflation, increases in insurance, etc. If not, then the formula should be updated, but that's not a reason to throw the baby out with the bath water.

I'm all for changing the law to allow tenants to contribute to optional upgrades. We wanted solar panels installed, and even offered to pay the full cost in monthly installments, in lieu of the monthly electric bill, which our landlord passes on to us anyway. He was supportive in principle, but wasn't willing to take out a loan nor to enter an agreement with a solar company that offers \$0 down with 25 years of monthly payments, even knowing that he could pass on 100% of those costs to us, and even future tenants if we move out.

Costa Hawkins handcuffs local govt, preventing improvements in rent control where it exists, and blocking other municipalities from even considering it. Repealing it is long overdue.

Opposed by the usual suspects (esp. Realtor Associations).

Note that Jesse Arreguin does not support this, even though many mayors do. Perhaps because his State Senate race is funded in part by Realtor associations. One more strong sign that Arreguin is NOT the progressive voice that can appropriately represent this most progressive slice of California in Sacramento.

Endorsed by most progressive organizations. League of Women Voters is neutral on Prop 33, as they are swayed by studies suggesting that rent control discourages development of new housing, which tempers LWV's enthusiasm for the short term benefits of rent-control. SF Berniecrats is "Hell Yes!!!" on Prop 33.

[Top](#)

PROP 34 - Patient Spending - No

From [Courage Campaign](#):

Vote NO on Proposition 34 to continue to permit health-care providers to have autonomy in deciding how to use revenue earned through the federal discount prescription drug program.

Proposition 34 is a real estate industry effort to limit organizations that receive federal drug program funding—especially the AIDS Healthcare Foundation (AHF)—from funding ballot initiatives, including supporting Proposition 33 on rent control on this general election ballot.

The initiative seeks to create a new category of state entities called “prescription drug price manipulators,” and to place tight restrictions on the requirements those organizations must meet to maintain their tax-exempt status. The initiative defines prescription drug price manipulators as any entity that is an active participant in the federal 340B drug price discount program, is licensed to act as a health-care provider in the state, contracts with Medi-Cal as a provider, has contributed over \$100 million over the last 10 years to initiatives unrelated to direct patient care, and has owned multifamily properties that have received a minimum of 500 government violations. If passed, Proposition 34 would require organizations designated as prescription drug price manipulators to spend a minimum of 98% of their revenues from the federal prescription drug program on direct patient care activities, and also abstain from any conduct that could be viewed as in opposition to public health and safety. In addition, Proposition 34 would codify the Medi-Cal Rx program, which was established in 2019 via an executive order from Gov. Gavin Newsom.

In recent years, AIDS Healthcare Foundation (AHF), which meets all the criteria for a prescription drug price manipulator, has provided extensive funding and advocacy support to ballot initiatives intended to support low-income housing development. Proposition 34, which is supported by a variety of actors with real estate interests, would curtail this organization’s capacity to distribute its funds in support of affordable housing initiatives.

[Top](#)

PROP 35 - Health care tax - yes

Prop 35 is a confusing change to how the state raises and spends money for Medi-Cal, a key part of our healthcare system. Everyone seems to agree the current system is flawed, with low reimbursement rates to doctors and other health care providers causing many to refuse to see Medi-Cal patients, who are disproportionately low income and from underserved communities. Key to the yes-vs-no dispute here is whether this will make the problem even worse by triggering a loss of federal matching funds.

Prop 35 will make a few key changes to the law, it would:

- convert a temporary tax to a permanent tax
- require the state to use more of the \$ to pay doctors more
- Cap the taxes charged to non-Medi-Cal health plans

The proponents of 35, which includes most health care companies, unions, etc., argue that these changes are needed to keep the revenue flowing, and to direct more to where it’s needed. Some argue that without Prop 35, the current funding system will run out, and put the entire Medi-Cal system at risk of collapse.

Opponents to 35 agree that while change to Medical funding is needed, the changes proposed risk making the financial situation even worse than it is now. The state receives \$7-\$8 billion per

year in matching funds from the US Federal Govt for the Medical taxes it receives. But apparently BOTH the Biden admin and the Trump admin (years ago), have warned California state officials that they're at risk of losing those matching federal funds because California puts too much of the tax burden on Medi-Cal health plans, and not enough on private-sector health insurance. Prop 35 would put a cap on how much the non-Medical plans could be taxed, so if the Federal Govt makes good on its threat, the state would either lose all those billions of \$ of matching funds, or it would need to cut its tax rate on Medi-cal plans to bring it in line with the non-Medical plans (because Prop 35 would prohibit raising the non-medical rates, so they wouldn't be able to balance them out that way). Either way, the state would end up with even less money available to support Medi-Cal providers than it has now.

We agree with some on both sides of Prop 35 that our medical system is flawed now, and will still be flawed regardless of whether 35 passes. What we really need is a single-payer National Health Care System. Until we get that, the best we can do is to keep applying band-aids to the inevitable gaps in our existing systems. Prop 35 seems like yet another imperfect band-aid that will require yet another fix in the not-too-distant future, but is still better than no band-aid at all.

Yes endorsed by [AC Greens](#), Wellstone Democratic Renewal Club, SF Berniecrats

Opponents include [League of Women Voters](#).

For a great review on Prop 35, see: [This California ballot measure promises money for health care. Its critics warn it could backfire](#)

[Top](#)

PROP 36 - Criminal penalties - NO!

Cindy: Strongly opposed by everyone working to end mass incarceration. Would be a huge setback and harm black and brown people who are already targeted by the criminal legal system. Takes money away from services that help people and reduce crime.

From KQED: \$750 million a year and takes money away from drug treatment, rehabilitation and victim services. Instead of funding drug treatment for people struggling with addiction, this measure would increase prison spending and bring back the war on drugs.

Roll back parts of a 2014 ballot measure (Prop 47) which reclassified certain petty crimes, theft and drug possession crimes as misdemeanors instead of felonies. Prop 36 would allow prosecutors to charge someone with a felony if they steal anything and have been convicted of theft twice before. It lets prosecutors seek felony charges for possessing drugs, including fentanyl, heroin and cocaine — though they could be given the choice to enter drug treatment.

[TOP](#)

II. Local Ballot Measures

Oakland Measures

Measure MM - wildfire prevention zone tax - YES

Impose a \$99 parcel tax (\$65 per condo/multifamily unit, variable for non-residential) in the “Wildfire Prevention Zone” (just certain parts of the Oakland Hills) generating \$2.67 million per year for 20 years to implement Oakland’s wildfire prevention plans (mostly vegetation management).

Includes \$ for more goats, some Eucalyptus cutting, and some herbicide use, but seems like it strikes a relatively healthy balance between minimizing fire risk for neighborhoods and residents, while protecting the woods, wildlife and natural habitats that are even more valuable than the views.

Requires a 2/3rds majority. Only on the ballots of residents of the parts of the Oakland Hills in the Wildlife Management Zone.

See “[Oakland’s Revised Vegetation Management Plan is the Compromise I hoped for](#)” for a map showing the areas included, along with a review of the Wildfire Management Plan that MM will fund.

See also: <https://oaklandside.org/2024/10/07/measure-mm-aims-to-secure-funding-for-wildfire-prevention/>

And <https://www.greenbelt.org/blog/yes-measure-mm-oakland/>

Measure NN: YES

Extend and increase the parking tax surcharge to 10% and the parcel tax to \$198 per year for single-family homes to fund citywide violence reduction services and increase minimum police and fire staffing. It funds the police but it also funds violence prevention. Oakland Rising Coalition, a collaborative of racial and economic justice organizations, says Yes.

Measure OO: revise public ethics, strengthen lobbyist regulations. + Democracy Dollars - YES

Updates the Public Ethics Commission with increased funding and staffing. In 2014 measure CC gave the commission more authority and autonomy (both good). The mayor, city attorney, and city auditor each appoint one member; the commission itself appoints the other 4.

Specifically, OO will:

- Increase autonomy: elected officials, employees, family members, etc. can’t serve on commission for at least 2 years after leaving office/employment.
- Strengthens limits on conflict of interest employment/contracts/gifts/political affiliation
- Allows commissioners to support relevant ballot measures
- Increases restrictions on lobbyist donations/gifts to elected officials, candidates, family members

See: <https://oaklandside.org/2024/10/03/oakland-measure-oo-strengthen-ethics-commission-election-2024/>

TOP

Berkeley Measures: <https://www.berkeleyside.org/2024/10/11/berkeley-ballot-measures-2024-election>

Measure W - YES

increase a real estate transfer tax to fund homelessness services

Will increase the existing tax on sales over \$1.5 million from 1.5% to 2.5%. “Estimated to generate an additional \$2 [million] to \$4 million for \$5 [million] to \$9 million of total tax revenue.” Simple majority will pass this.

Measure X - YES

parcel tax of \$0.06 per square foot of improvements (residential), \$0.09 per square foot other, to maintain Berkeley Public Library. 2/3rds majority required

Measure Y - Yes

increase a parcel tax to \$0.2652 per square foot of improvements to fund parks, trees and landscape maintenance. 2/3rds majority required.

Key benefits would be maintenance \$ for existing parks, and urban tree-planting, especially in the flats.

AC Greens notes that Measure Y basically asks “should the special parcel tax for Parks, Trees and Landscaping Maintenance increase by \$0.0442 to maintain and upgrade city parks, take advantage of the state and federal park grants that require matching funds, and increase the tree canopy in Berkeley?

We do have reservations about Measure Y accelerating the trend of cutting down trees in the Berkeley Hills under the guise of wildfire prevention. No mention of protection of wildlife or habitat, nor adding any green space. Of course, we want everyone to be safe from fires, and for our parks to be well-maintained. We hope Measure Y will not add to the excessive removal of trees and loss of urban greenery and conversion of open space into barren fire breaks.

Measure Z - YES

make the sugary tax permanent: remove the 2027 expiration of the \$0.01 per fl. oz. tax on the distribution of sodas and other sugary drinks and sweeteners, paid by distributors.

Berkeley was one of the first places in the US to impose a tax on sodas and other sugary drinks, with the stated goal of reducing consumption and using the revenue to address the negative health impacts caused by excessive sugar intake (following the model of tobacco taxes).

Berkeley shouldn't (and likely won't) be the first place to let this expire.

Measure AA - YES

increase the City of Berkeley's spending limit.

A fairly technical proposition to remove a legal impediment to the City raising and spending the money it needs for all services, infrastructure improvements, schools, etc.

Measure BB - YES

use existing revenue to fund housing retention and homelessness prevention, modify grounds for eviction, remove exemptions from rent control and registration for certain units, limit the ways tenants can be charged for utilities, limit the maximum annual rent increase to 5%, eliminate suspension of rent controls during high vacancy, and require notice to new tenants of their rights

BB supports tenants, and is pro-housing (e.g. ending some exemptions from rent-control). CC is pro-landlords / property owners (e.g. expanding some exemptions from rent-control).

BB is competing with CC, the one that gets the most votes wins.

Measure CC - NO

use existing revenue to fund rent payments to property owners on certain tenants' behalf, expand exemptions from rent control and registration for certain single-family homes and two-unit properties, allow property owners and tenants to agree to rent increases in exchange for services or amenities, modify certain grounds for eviction, and remove certain powers from the Rent Board

Competing with BB, the one that gets the most votes wins. BB supports tenants, and is pro-housing (e.g. ending some exemptions from rent-control). CC is pro-landlords / property owners (e.g. expanding some exemptions from rent-control).

Measure DD - YES

prohibit establishments where livestock are kept for 45 days or more in a 12-month period and require existing facilities to cease operations within one year by imposing a \$10,000 penalty per violation per day

In the wake of the closing of Golden Gate Fields, Measure DD seeks to prevent the development of any new or future endeavor that would similarly house large numbers of horse, cows, or other livestock.

Measure EE - NO! No on EE, Yes on FF *(Note this is a reversal from the initial draft of this doc and the email blast I sent out, in which I argued in favor of FF and against EE)*

parcel tax for 12 years of \$0.13 per square foot of improvements to fund street and sidewalk repair, pedestrian safety and environmental infrastructure

My first take on EE (and FF) was mistaken, I wrongfully believed that the smaller tax proposed by EE would more effectively target necessary road improvements. Further reading, and advice from several people convinced me that EE is in fact a disingenuous attempt to prevent extension of bike lanes, and doesn't even improve roads as much as FF would.

"EE will fund much needed upgrades on streets, bicycle lanes, pedestrian safety projects, green infrastructure, with an emphasis on underserved neighborhoods."

EE is competing with FF. The one that gets the most votes wins (majority required).

EE is a bad-faith counterproposal to FF designed to halt improvements in transit and cycling. Even though it's basically written as an effort to keep Berkeley prioritizing cars uber alles, it actually provides LESS funding for road maintenance than FF does (and anyone who has driven OR biked around Berkeley knows our streets need a LOT of maintenance).

The people who wrote EE apparently backed out of FF which itself was a compromise crafted to include their interests and concerns. The point of compromise is not everyone gets what they want, but hopefully we all move in the right direction. EE is the wrong direction. FF is better.

Measure FF - YES! Yes on FF, no on EE (Note this is a reversal from the initial draft of this doc and the email blast I sent out, in which I argued in favor of FF and against EE)

Parcel tax for 14 years of \$0.17 per square foot of improvements to dwelling and \$0.25 per square foot of other property to fund street and sidewalk repair, safe streets and environmental infrastructure.

Similar to / competing with EE. The one that gets the most votes wins.

I was initially confused about EE and FF, and mistakenly believed that EE was the reasonable alternative, with FF accelerating some unfortunate design trends, making streets less manageable for all.

It turns out that FF is, in fact, the moderate compromise measure, the result of a long process bringing together disparate interests, and EE is a counterproposal by anti-bike, anti-transit, cars-only anti-change holdouts. Thanks to Justin It even offers more \$ for streets than EE. The only thing that even EE proponents argue would be advanced better via EE is sidewalk repair, and it's hard to see how that should be a priority over crosswalks, street repair, transit, bike lanes, etc.

For more details on why FF is not only better than EE, but essential for improving Berkeley's streets for drivers AND cyclists, check out [Darrel Owens' impressive recounting of the proposal and the process](#)

Huge thanks to Justin Kao for pointing me to this, and for pointing out that I had originally had this backwards. Justin creates [his own voter guide](#) every election, we don't agree on everything, but he's very thoughtful and principled, and provides a lot of great links and other resources.

Measure GG - NO

Tax of \$2.9647 per therm of natural gas consumed annually in buildings 15,000 square feet or larger (except govt buildings, single-family residences, and residential buildings with at least 50% affordable units) to fund building decarbonization programs, to increase at 6% more than inflation rate every year.

See: <https://www.berkeleyside.org/2024/10/04/measure-gg-a-new-tax-on-natural-gas-use-in-big-berkeley-buildings>

Measure GG is all stick and no carrot, whose admirable goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by getting building owners to switch from natural gas to electric, isn't enough to justify its means of excessively burdening valuable institutions and small businesses with massive additional costs. It aims to generate millions of dollars off this burden, with the revenue being admirably used to help cover the costs of converting residences elsewhere in the city from methane-emitting natural gas to electricity. But again, it puts an excessive burden for raising those funds on a small number of institutions.

According to Berkeleyside, the tax could triple the natural gas bill for affected businesses and nonprofits. Places like Berkeley Bowl, Alta Bates, Sutter Health, etc. could end up being charged >\$100,000 per year each. There's no funding for the costly conversions they'll need to switch away from natural gas, the only incentive is to avoid the massive tax.

AC Greens and the [Berkeley Tenants Union](#) enthusiastically support a Yes vote on GG. AC Greens focuses on the benefits of eliminating methane production both from the large buildings that will be taxed, and the residences that will get electrification funding from the tax. They claim GG will prohibit large building owners from passing costs on to tenants but they don't explain how. And what would stop businesses that own their own building from passing on those costs on to consumers, or just closing up shop and leaving? We have concerns this could add to the already real risk of Berkeley losing some of these key institutions. Even the Brower Center, Berkeley's environmental NGO hub, opposes it.

Finally, while electrification of fossil fuel-based systems is a key step toward reducing greenhouse gas emissions, converting merely from PG&E natural gas to PG&E electricity might not be the GHG reductions we're looking for. What we need is not only for people to get off of natural gas, but we also need locally sourced clean electricity generation and storage for them to switch to.

On that last note, Measure GG doubles down on the fossil-fuel based electric grids we need to move away from which have proven unreliable in key moments, and which generate wildfires. GG would just further the concentration of wealth and political power in the investor-owned quasi-public utilities that are accelerating the construction & promotion of massive, destructive wind and solar farms, and who have been obstructing the advancement of the broadly dispersed, local electricity solutions we need.

Measure HH - No

Measure HH would require city-owned and city-leased buildings to meet new indoor air quality standards set and prohibit the use of technologies that emit harmful chemicals, gasses and sounds in order to comply.

See: <https://www.californiachoices.org/alameda-measure-hh-2024>

AC Greens and the Tenants Unit enthusiastically support HH, too. But like GG, this prop seems like too much stick and not enough carrot. And it seems like a 4-years belated reaction to the pandemic-era preoccupation with indoor air filtration. The costs to the City of Berkeley seem exorbitant, millions of \$ will have to come from somewhere else in Berkeley's budget, meaning other things will need to be cut.

So, yes, better filtered indoor air in City-owned buildings would be good, reducing exposure to airborne pollutants and infectious diseases (CoVID and otherwise) would of course be a positive step. But we no longer believe we're actually stopping the spread. And all this at the expense of what?

[TOP](#)

Albany Measures

Measure L - YES

Albany USD school bond: \$63.8 million in bonds -

Measure C - YES

\$0.017 per square foot parcel tax for sidewalks and pathways

Measure R - YES

Tax on residential rental businesses to support tenant rental assistance - YES

Measure S - yes

Allow the city manager to appoint city officers and department heads -
AC Greens says "yes" without explanation.

From KQED:

Yes Argument

"Of the cities in Alameda County, all but three, including Albany, provide their city manager appointment authority over officers and department heads. This change will make hiring easier by streamlining the process and ensuring the retention of qualified city managers."

No Argument

None filed.

Measure T - yes

Eliminate the requirement that officers execute a bond before entering upon their official duties .

AC Greens says "yes" without explanation.

My understanding is that the “bond” referred to here is a sum of money that Albany has been requiring elected officials to put up before entering office, as reserve funds in case the city gets sued for something they do. This is the first I’ve ever heard of this, I have no idea how widespread these requirements are, or if Albany is an outlier.

From KQED:

Yes Argument

“The language in the charter is not clear as to what offices might be required to post a bond, leaving ambiguity regarding the city’s practices. By removing this language and stating that the city overrides California Government Code, we can eliminate this ambiguity and ensure city practices reflect the charter and best practices for the modern day.”

No Argument

None filed.

Measure U - sure. why not.

Include school bonds in the city’s bonding limit.

AC Greens says “yes” without explanation. Correct me if I’m wrong, but my understanding is that this would allow the school district to issue bonds at a lower risk rating (and therefore at a lower interest rate), by being included within the City’s bonding limit rather than standalone.

Measure V - YES!!

allow 16-year-olds to vote in local and school district elections

We absolutely need to do more to get teens engaged with our political decision-making processes. Giving teens the right to vote in school district elections makes perfect sense, as it’s the realm that most directly affects them (and affects them far more directly than almost all 18+ voters).

Giving teens the right to vote in local elections is brilliant for another reason. It incentivizes them to learn about local issues and find out where various candidates stand on them. It engages them in what voting and preparing to vote SHOULD be: a process of research, discussion, and debate on substantive issues, rather than getting caught up in the absurdity, horse-races, pettiness, vacuousness and sheer manipulation of high-profile, highly-financed national electoral races. Dear reader, you may have noticed: this is exactly what my voter guide is all about!!

So YES!!! Albany - get those teens educated and engaged in local political issues. And tell others in other districts the benefits of this too!

Hayward Measures

- **Measure K1:** 20-year renewal of 0.5% sales tax - **YES**

Sales taxes are regressive. What's even more regressive? Austerity.

The inevitable cuts in municipal services that would result from ending Hayward's sales tax will disproportionately harm lower income residents and less-resources, underserved, and otherwise disadvantaged communities in general. Disproportionate both relative to their more privileged neighbors, and to the benefits they'll receive by avoiding 0.5% of a ~10% sales tax.

TOP

2. Contra Costa County:

El Cerrito Measure G - 1% Sales Tax - YES

Richmond Measure J - non-partisan municipal primaries **NO**

More voters show up for general elections than primaries or midterms. Only more affluent candidates could afford to run two elections. Big polluters like Chevron support this measure so as to maintain political control of Richmond. [Richmond Progressive Alliance](#)

Richmond Measure L - Ranked Choice Voting - **YES! YES! YES!!!**

Ranked Choice Voting is a powerful improvement in how we run elections. It's basically an instant runoff that avoids the "lesser of two evils" spoiler dilemma, where you get to include a 2nd choice (and sometimes a 3rd, 4th or even more options).

If no candidate gets a majority of first choice votes, then whoever got the fewest 1st choice votes clearly did not win. Their ballots are redistributed among the remaining candidates according to who those voters listed as their 2nd choice. All ballots are now recounted, and if there still isn't a candidate with a majority, the new lowest vote-getter is eliminated and their votes redistributed based on 2nd (or 3rd) choices, and so on until you have a winner.

Ranked choice voting lets you vote your conscience for the candidate you REALLY want, while still hedging your bet with a 2nd (or lower) choice for the candidate you prefer among the few we're told by the media has the best chance of winning. If we had RCV for presidential elections, we would've had President Gore in 2000 and Hillary in 2016, and there'd be no problem with people choosing a 3rd party candidate as their 1st choice in swing states.

And the process incentivizes candidates to appeal more broadly, in an effort to gain 2nd and 3rd choice ballots. It helps moderate our politics in general, making it much harder for extremist, polarizing candidates who are disliked / distrusted by the majority of voters to win.

It's been working well in SF, Oakland, Berkeley, and elsewhere and building momentum nationwide. It's not hard, it's more democratic, and it counters the trend towards extremist divisive candidates. **Vote Yes for Ranked Choice Voting!**

[TOP](#)

[San Francisco Propositions:](#) (see also [Axios](#), [SF Chronicle](#), [SPUR](#), [SF Rising](#) and [SF Berniecrats](#))

SF Prop A YES

Schools Improvement and Safety Bond Bonds - \$790 million for SFUSD public schools:

- \$410 million for modernization projects (large construction projects at existing facilities)
- \$95 million for core functionality projects (basic needs such as restrooms, lighting, leaks, and electrical outlets)
- \$225 million for Student Nutrition Services projects, including a new central hub for Student Nutrition Services and upgrades to kitchens and dining spaces
- \$35 million for technology upgrades
- \$15 million for security projects, completing building communication and keyless entry upgrades to 100% of school sites
- \$10 million for schoolyard outdoor learning projects, improving schoolyards that facilitate play, physical education, and access to nature

Pros

- SFUSD has successfully four local bond measures since 2003 to complete upgrades at every school site. are only spent on the bond project list.
- Prop. A would allow SFUSD to expand Student Nutrition Services and ensure that students in need have access to healthy meals.
- Prop. 2, a \$10 billion state bond measure for school facilities, is also on the ballot this November. If it passes, SFUSD would be able to leverage the local bond funds provided by Prop. A as match funding.
- Project selection would be data-driven and informed by the district's extensive master planning and community outreach process.
- The bond measure would not raise tax rates.

Cons

- This bond measure would not provide sufficient funding to address all of SFUSD's aging facilities and would only address some of the backlogged projects proposed for funding under

the 2016 bond. (The district estimates that repairing all school facilities would cost approximately \$6 billion and plans to propose another large bond measure in 2028.)

Unclear if there's any connection to SFUSD's school closure plan. Saving \$ is a major reason the district has been giving to justify the closures. Does that mean there's a greater imperative for SF voters to approve Prop A? Or will some voters think they don't need the money since they're closing schools? Or if Prop A passes, will that become a rationale against closing any schools?

Lots of consternation about which schools will close, the initial "eligible" list was supposed to be released Oct. 8 (after repeated delays), but the final list won't be approved till after the election.

Endorsed by both SPUR and SF Berniecrats

SF Prop B YES

Community Health and Medical Facilities, Street Safety, Public Spaces, and Shelter to Reduce Homelessness Bond

Proposition B would authorize the City of San Francisco to issue \$390 million in general obligation bonds to fund infrastructure and upgrades that would benefit public health and post-pandemic recovery, specifically focusing on community health and medical facilities, shelter to reduce homelessness, bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, and outdoor public gathering spaces.

The expenditure plan would distribute the funds as follows:

- \$205.1 million for public health infrastructure
- \$50 million for supportive shelter for homeless families
- \$63.9 million for street safety improvements
- \$71 million for public spaces, such as Harvey Milk Plaza, Powell Street, and the cable car turnaround

San Francisco's policy is to issue new bonds only as older ones are retired or as assessed property values increase. Therefore, Prop. B would not increase property tax rates. An existing Citizens' Oversight Committee would audit use of the bond funds every year.

Prop. B includes funding for the following projects:

- **Public health:** Renovating and expanding the Chinatown Public Health Center, relocating City Clinic, and making critical repairs to the city's two largest public health institutions: Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital and Laguna Honda Hospital
- **Street safety improvements:** Transforming high-traffic sidewalks, intersections, and streets to create a safer and more enjoyable environment for bicyclists and pedestrians; supporting critical traffic safety and road design upgrades; and improving Sloat Boulevard to enhance traffic flow and provide safer access to the San Francisco Zoo
- **Shelter for homeless families:** Constructing, renovating, or acquiring sites for family housing and shelter

- **Revitalizing public spaces:** Improving San Francisco’s outdoor civic spaces, including Harvey Milk Plaza in the Castro, Powell Street, and the cable car turnaround

This measure was placed on the ballot by Mayor London Breed. As a general obligation bond, Prop. B needs a two-thirds vote to pass.¹

Equity Impacts

Investments in Chinatown Public Health Center, Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital, and City Clinic would increase access to quality care for marginalized communities. Currently, these communities face significant health disparities, in large part due to gaps in access and in culturally competent care. The investments provided by Prop. B would benefit tens of thousands of monolingual Chinese patients, LGBTQ+ patients, people experiencing homelessness, and adults in need of inpatient psychiatric care.

Pros

- It is a best practice for cities to continually reinvest in existing infrastructure to ensure that public resources remain in a state of good repair and are up to the challenges of the day. This bond prioritizes many of the issues post-pandemic San Francisco faces, which include family homelessness, street safety, public health, and economic revitalization.
- The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency is unable to deliver on the city’s commitment to zero traffic deaths² without money to build safer infrastructure, such as crosswalks, protected bicycle lanes, and other traffic calming measures.
- The availability of private funds and state funds to supplement public investment in outdoor civic spaces would make local taxpayer dollars go further. For example, Harvey Milk Plaza in the Castro has been able to fundraise in the community and secure state grants, which would add to the bond investment in the space.

Cons

- San Francisco has many pressing capital needs that compete for relatively few spots in the capital planning cycle. This bond measure, like any general obligation bond, could impact the city’s ability to fund other important priorities.

SPUR's Recommendation: *The COVID-19 pandemic was a clarifying moment for San Francisco, putting on full display the strengths of — and cracks in — San Francisco’s public resources. Designed to help the city recover on myriad fronts, this bond measure would support a rich array of SPUR priorities, such as street safety, housing for homeless families, high-quality outdoor civic spaces, and the commitment that all people should have fair and just access to basic rights like health care. This bond elegantly ties together a number of pressing needs with the single theme of positively envisioning the future San Francisco wants to achieve and what critical investments are necessary to get there.*

Endorsed by both SPUR and SF Berniecrats

SF Prop C yes

Inspector General

Endorsed by SF Berniecrats. Spur neutral

From KQED:

Should the city of San Francisco create a new position of inspector general in the Controller's Office and give the Controller's Office additional powers to investigate fraud, waste, and abuse?

Yes Argument

"To create a more effective, accountable government, voters can approve the Inspector General Charter Amendment. This will establish our own inspector general with the power to investigate and bring to justice complaints of waste, fraud, and abuse. And since it will be part of the Controller's Office, no new taxes will be needed to fund the office."

No Argument

"San Francisco has a long history of corruption scandals, another bureaucrat won't fix that. What's needed is fresh faces in elected office, transparency and accountability. We've seen these 'reforms' before. They promise to clean up City Hall, yet the problems deepen. This is more of the same — a distraction from the real work on holding civil servants accountable."

SF Prop D **NO**

City Commissions and Mayoral Authority

From KQED:

Should San Francisco eliminate dozens of city commissions and cap the total number at 65?

Proposition D would reform the city's commission system by reducing the number of commissions from 130 to a maximum of 65. These commissions currently provide public oversight of city departments and programs.

Yes Argument

Proposition D would cap the number of commissions at 65, streamline governance and give the mayor sole authority to appoint and remove department heads. It would also allow the police chief to unilaterally adopt and change police-conduct rules.

No Argument

Proposition D, supported by the moderate political advocacy group TogetherSF Action, could result in the elimination of several key commissions, including the police and arts commissions. It would consolidate power in the hands of the mayor and police chief and remove commissions that enable public participation and provide government oversight.

Key Supporters:

In Support

Mark Farrell, former interim mayor and supervisor, current mayoral candidate, San Francisco

Thomas Mazzucco, former police commissioner, San Francisco

Abigail Porth, former human rights commissioner, San Francisco

Chinese American Democratic Club
TogetherSF Action

In Opposition

ACLU of Northern California

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Small Business Forward

SOMArts

United Educators of San Francisco

Also Opposed by both SPUR and SF
Berniecrats

SF Prop E yes

Creating a Task Force to Recommend Changing, Eliminating, or Combining City Commissions

From KQED:

Should San Francisco create a task force to review the city's 130 commissions, gather public feedback, and implement changes to the city's charter based on their findings?

Proposition E, supported by Board of Supervisors President Aaron Peskin, is a competing measure (to Proposition D) focused on city commissions. It would establish a task force to analyze the costs and overall necessity of these commissions, and provide reform recommendations to the mayor and Board of Supervisors.

Yes Argument

Creating a task force would increase public transparency in reviewing, changing, or potentially eliminating city commissions. It would also give voters a say in future changes to the city charter, and preserve the city's important arts, library, health, small business and police commissions.

Endorsed SF Berniecrats, opposed by SPUR

No Argument

A task force approach would delay much-needed reforms to the city's commission system until 2026 and water-down the more aggressive commission cuts proposed in Proposition D.

SF Prop F no

Police Staffing and Deferred Retirement

Although the simple reading of the measure doesn't make it sound this way, opponents of Prop F credibly argue that Prop F would allow police officers to double their salaries.

From KQED:

Should the city of San Francisco allow police officers to continue working for the Department after retiring, with pension payments deferred while they are working?

Yes Argument

“Proposition F curbs our ongoing loss of police officers by creating a strong incentive for frontline SFPD officers, inspectors, and sergeants to postpone retirement for up to five years to focus on neighborhood patrol and investigations. San Francisco’s Police Department is severely short-staffed. SFPD is short more than 500 of the 2,074 full-duty officers needed to keep San Francisco safe. Each year since 2019, SFPD has lost more officers than it can recruit.”

No Argument

“Proposition F is a City Hall insider redo of a policy that’s already been tried and was a massive failure. Voting Yes on F would be a vote for an extremely expensive program that San Francisco cannot afford, that won’t keep us safer. Proposition F would force taxpayers to pay some individual officers up to half a million dollars by allowing them to double dip into salaries and banked pension statements.”

Opposed by SF Berniecrats

SF Prop G YES

Funding Rental Subsidies for Affordable Housing Serving Seniors, Families, and Disabilities

From KQED:

Should the city of San Francisco spend at least \$8.25 million to subsidize rent for seniors, families and persons with disabilities earning extremely low incomes?

One way San Francisco creates affordable housing is by providing loans to developers for projects that benefit lower-income residents who earn no more than 80% of the area median income. But for people earning 35% of area median income, the existing loan programs fall short. Proposition G would create a fund to help those on extremely low incomes by requiring the city to contribute \$8.25 million of its general fund starting in 2026 through 2046.

Yes Argument

San Francisco is committed to expanding housing opportunities for seniors, families and people with disabilities. Proposition G helps

achieve this goal by committing a stable and consistent level of funding, creating hundreds of more affordable units and establishing a public

process for the development and oversight of the program.

No Argument

Proposition G diverts the city's general fund to subsidize rent, a short-term "fix" with harsh

long-term consequences. The measure drains critical resources from essential services like public safety, infrastructure and education. Committing general funds to dubious subsidies raises prices and drives up rents across the city.

Key Supporters

In Support

Aaron Peskin, president, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

London Breed, mayor, San Francisco

Faith in Action

Mission Housing

Self-Help for the Elderly

Also endorsed by both SPUR and SF Berniecrats

In Opposition

Larry Marso, technology executive & attorney

SF Prop H - Yes

Retirement Benefits for Firefighters

In general, I'm all for lowering retirement eligibility ages.

From KQED:

Should the city of San Francisco lower the age at which members of the Fire Department can receive the highest pension?\

Yes Argument

"Cancer is the leading cause of occupational death among firefighters. Firefighters have a 14% higher risk of dying from cancer than the general population. Since 2006, over 300 active and retired San Francisco firefighters have died because of cancer. More than

160 have been diagnosed with cancer in the past six years alone ... Proposition H would allow San Francisco's firefighters to cut their cancer risk by retiring at age 55."

No Argument

"San Francisco firefighters hired after Jan. 6, 2012 were made aware of the

new full pension retirement age of 58 (it was previously 55). The modification to the pension age was needed due to decades of fiscal mismanagement by the city government. By increasing

employee contribution rates for hires after that date, voters were protecting firefighters' pensions."

No position by neither SPUR nor SF Berniecrats

SF Prop I yes

Retirement Benefits for Nurses and 911 Operators

Should the city of San Francisco allow registered nurses who are members of the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System to purchase credits toward their total pension years of service?

From KQED:

Yes Argument

"Nurses are the only city employees not allowed to buy back pension time after becoming permanent employees. Proposition I fixes this loophole by giving temporary RNs the opportunity to join the ranks of our full-time nurses, with pension options for time worked, saving taxpayers 14%. Proposition I is a win-win-win for San Francisco's budget, taxpayers, and safety."

No Argument

"The controller costs the right to buy three years' past service credit at anywhere from \$1.5 million to \$4.4 million, given the uncertainty as to how many nurses will exercise it. But one popular website currently gives the median pay for a registered nurse in San Francisco as \$147,104 per year (85% above the national average, attributing the high wage to the high cost of living and a strong union)."

Endorsed by SF Berniecrats

SF Prop J no

Budget accountability for Children, Youth, and Families

Adding accountability and transparency to \$10s of millions the city spends annually sounds like a good thing. However, another component of Prop J sounds like a poison pill:

Proposition J would also revise the parameters for the Student Success Fund, which voters approved in 2022 and which gives grants to schools to boost student academic performance and social-emotional wellness. The fund's expenditures would no longer count toward the city's annually required spending on programs for children and youths.

This bureaucratic detail would have major financial consequences, creating a spending hole that would need to be filled. This fiscal year, officials would have to siphon up to \$35 million from other parts of the city's budget, according to an analysis by the controller's office. Each subsequent year, for 14 years, the hole would be between \$35 million and \$83 million.

From: <https://www.sfpublicpress.org/proposition-j-increase-oversight-of-city-funding-for-children-and-youth-programs/>

I haven't found any explanation for why the board of supervisors added this provision, what's the benefit of it (does that mean \$35 million more will be spent on other youth & family programs?), where they think the additional \$35-83 million annually will come from, what they will cut to fill that hole if revenue doesn't increase, etc.

From KQED:

Should the city of San Francisco create a new group to evaluate city spending on children, youth and their families?

Yes Argument

"While San Francisco has always prioritized our children, there is a need for better transparency and efficiency in the way we allocate our funding so we can address growing unmet needs and improve our outcomes. Without raising taxes and by using resources we already have, this measure will coordinate and align city departments and SFUSD to develop a unified Plan and Outcomes Framework to improve the outcomes for children and youth, and ensure budget accountability."

No Argument: None filed.

Supported by the SF Board of Supervisors, who voted unanimously to put this on the ballot.

Opposed by SF Berniecrats who say it would give the mayor more control over SFUSD's funds (the mayor could withhold funds based on the new accountability reports the school district would be required to file with the new commission created by J).

SF Prop K - yes

Permanently Close the Upper Great Highway to Establish a Public Open Space

Should the Upper Great Highway become a permanent oceanside park?

There are those who live locally who feel that this is not necessary since it's closed on weekends and the beach is already an open public space, and it will increase traffic elsewhere.

Those who are in favor appreciated when the road was entirely closed during the pandemic and there was more room for safe access by those not in cars.

Note that a section at the south end is going to remain closed permanently regardless of whether K passes, because of technical issues.

Part of the argument in favor of closing it is the high maintenance costs resulting from frequent impacts from storms which bury it under sand; these impacts are expected to worsen with rising sea levels.

See SPUR for much more info on K, the backstory, and a map of the stretch of Great Highway that would be closed (and the street that is going to be closed regardless), and the alternate route that would be used:

<https://www.spur.org/voter-guide/2024-11/sf-prop-k-upper-great-highway>

From KQED:

Proposition K would ban all car traffic on the Upper Great Highway between Lincoln Way and Sloat Boulevard and convert the road into permanent public recreation space. Authorized vehicles, such as emergency vehicles and intra-park shuttles, will still have access to the road.

Yes Argument

San Francisco closed the Upper Great Highway to car traffic during a COVID-19 pandemic-era pilot program, allowing thousands of people to bicycle, skate, walk and listen to live music performances along the historic road. The southern portion of the Great Highway is already slated to be permanently closed due to environmental erosion. Banning cars will environmentally benefit the coastline, and

benefit local vendors, who can boost the neighborhood's economy.

No Argument

Turning the Upper Great Highway into a permanent park will force car commuters on the city's west side to pivot their route and risks pushing more cars, pollution and noise into neighboring residential streets.

Key Supporters

In Support

Sharky Laguana, former president, Small Business Commission

Kid Safe SF

Outer Sunset Neighbors Richmond Family San Francisco

San Francisco Parks Alliance

also endorsed by both SPUR and SF Berniecrats

In Opposition

Richard Correia, vice president, Planning Association for the Richmond

Chinatown Merchants United Association of San Francisco, Sunset Branch

Chinese American Democratic Club

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

SF Prop L YES!!!

Tax rideshare, self-driving systems and other private Transportation to Fund Public Transit

Uber, Lyft et al have been manipulative and distorting enough of our political process.

From KQED:

Should the city of San Francisco impose an additional tax on transportation network companies and autonomous vehicle businesses?

Yes Argument

“Families, seniors and workers need reliable trains and buses to bring them to school and work, run errands, and visit loved ones. Service cuts will leave transit-dependent riders stranded and force many into driving or paying for expensive ride-hail services. Underfunding Muni will also lead to more traffic and more competition for parking, making travel throughout the city harder for those who must drive.”

No Argument

“Proposition L burdens San Francisco’s vulnerable populations. It harms San Franciscans who rely on rideshares for essential needs. Rideshares discourage impaired driving and help workers get home safely during non-traditional hours. Seniors and disabled residents with limited transit access rely on rideshares to get around the city. Making rideshares more expensive punishes these vulnerable groups.”

Endorsed by both SPUR and SF Berniecrats

SF Prop M no

Changes to Business Taxes

from KQED:

Should the city of San Francisco adjust business tax rates, increase small business tax exemptions, and change how the city calculates taxes?

Yes Argument

“San Francisco currently has some of the highest business tax rates in the country, penalizing both small and large businesses for continuing to operate here. Proposition M will lower taxes and by doing so, create a better environment for future investments and growth. This is a proactive step towards helping our economy and ensuring San Francisco

continues to be a place of innovation and opportunity.”

No Argument

“This isn’t a ‘tweak,’ it’s a massive increase that could drastically alter the financial future of major companies. Proponents claim the measure is ‘revenue neutral.’ The controller disagrees: It’s a \$50 million/year tax increase. It shifts the burden heavily onto businesses still

reeling from San Francisco's COVID collapse. These steep tax hikes will force companies to reduce investments, cut jobs and reconsider operating in San Francisco entirely."

Endorsed by SPUR, opposed by SF Berniecrats

SF Prop N no

First Responder Student Loan and Training Reimbursement Fund

We are hopefully on the cusp of a major shift in how we handle student debt as a society. Large scale debt forgiveness can only come from the federal government. SF's budget already faces severe limitations, and should have yet another obligation added to it, especially when it's something that is best fulfilled by Federal funds.

From KQED:

Should the city of San Francisco create a fund to help reimburse city employees and first responders for their student loans, education and training programs?

Yes Argument

"By offering student loan reimbursement assistance, Proposition N creates more appealing career paths for prospective candidates, helping San Francisco attract highly skilled, trained, dedicated first responders. In a highly competitive job market, that's essential."

No Argument

"Proposition N sets a troubling precedent by using taxpayer money to pay off personal debts. This could open the door to similar demands from across the San Francisco civil service. City resources are strained, and diverting funds to personal debts may come at the expense of critical services like public safety, housing, and education."

SF Prop O YES

Supporting Reproductive Rights

From KQED:

Should it be city policy and law to support, protect, and expand reproductive rights and services?

Yes Argument

"Passing Proposition O is not just about preserving rights; it's about protecting lives. Comprehensive reproductive care leads to healthier families and

communities. Proposition O ensures that women and all people who can become pregnant are not forced into dangerous or untenable situations."

No Argument

“This measure goes way beyond ‘pro-life versus pro-choice.’ Proposition O will discriminate against life-affirming health care facilities that San Francisco

citizens depend on and lessen the number of services they can provide to the community.”

Endorsed by SF Berniecrats

[TOP](#)

3. [Marin County](#)

Many local school bonds and parcel taxes for schools and infrastructure. I almost all recommend a Yes vote on those. What school district (or city's infrastructure) **doesn't** need more \$?

Two rent-control-related ballot measures seemed interesting and important enough to include. As renters ourselves, we're particularly sensitive to this topic. We would not be able to stay in our home without rent control. The percentage of residents who rent their homes vs. owning has increased dramatically in both California and the US in general, creating yet one more angle for the skyrocketing economic disparities in America further concentrating ever greater wealth and power in the hands of an ever smaller slice of society. So I generally support rent control and other legal protections for tenants:

Measure I (Fairfax): NO

From KQED:

Should the town of Fairfax's eviction protections and rent stabilization ordinances be repealed and replaced with state standards?

Yes Argument

"These extreme ordinances passed by Fairfax Town Council will not help affordability or increase the availability of rental housing. These ill-conceived and divisive rent control ordinances make evicting disruptive renters and roommates nearly impossible, threatening community safety, and neighborhood peace. Many homeowners are now reluctant or unwilling to rent ADU's or single rooms due to the extreme eviction protections passed by Fairfax Town Council."

No Argument

"Fairfax's current rent control laws guarantee a fair return for landlords, help working families stay in their homes, and don't impact homeowners. We carefully crafted our local rent control ordinances with all constituents in mind. These laws prevent neighbors from being priced out and include safeguards against arbitrary evictions for seniors, disabled residents, teachers, and families with school-age children."

From Jess Lerner:

Voting yes on Measure I in Fairfax would repeal the rent control ordinances, not protect them. The campaign for "yes on I" has spread a lot of misinformation. I am for rent control. No on I is the progressive vote- but several people I trust have also made me aware the ordinance is flawed as is. So the options are to repeal it completely for no extra protections (that's yes on I) or keep it and continue to amend (No on I.) I am voting NO because the current council has committed to uplifting this and making edits, but others are trying to replace those members with conservative voices. If repealed, the rent control ordinance would be on a "freeze" for a year before they could address it again, and there may be new council members who oppose rent control and won't rewrite. I would vote NO on I for protecting rent control.

Measure N (San Anselmo) -

Should the town of San Anselmo enact a limit on rent increases of 5%, or 60% of inflation — whichever is lower?

From KQED:

Yes Argument

“Measure N keeps our community strong by applying local rent control to San Anselmo’s medium-to-large-sized rental properties. Local rent control is a time-tested tool that keeps young families, essential workers, and fixed-income seniors in place. Hundreds of thousands of renters across the Bay Area are protected by local rent control, with people-first policies that limit increases to a percentage of inflation (CPI). San Anselmo renters deserve such protections.”

No Argument

“Measure N allows annual rent increases of only 60% of the local consumer price index. Without a tenant-specific meter it prohibits any utility pass-through to the tenant irrespective of the extent of the tenant’s utility use. It also prohibits pass-through of insurance increases. Utility and insurance costs have skyrocketed. Forcing landlords to absorb all these increased costs is neither balanced nor fair.”

5. Sonoma County Ballot Measures (see also [Ballotpedia](#))

Many local school bonds and parcel taxes for schools. I almost all recommend a Yes vote on those. What school district ***doesn’t*** need more \$?

Four more interesting ballot measures, with my recommendation, and [KQED’s summaries](#):

Sonoma County, Measure J - YES!

Should the county of Sonoma enact a ban on farms designated as Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations?

Sonoma County voters have the remarkable opportunity to take a stand for a significant turn towards more sustainable farming, by voting to ban one of the most environmentally and ethically abusive forms of farming in history.

Measure J will most likely not pass. Factory farming will not be banned in Sonoma or anywhere else anytime soon. It seems every elected official in Sonoma County is against it, as are a wide range of organizations. The opposition has built an extremely well-financed and effective campaign against it.

If the opposition is to be believed (and lots of people believe them), the “unintended consequences” of Measure J would be devastating for the entire economy of Sonoma County, and for local sustainable agriculture in particular. Even people who are otherwise sympathetic

to improving animal rights and environmental sustainability, and might vote to end factory farming elsewhere seem geared up to vote against this. (a twist on NIMBYism)

Because you are not being asked the question you should be asked, which is simply, “Should we raise and keep animals for food in massive factory farms?”

Instead, you are forced to vote on the minutiae of implementation, with precise maximums and minimums and enforcement and costs and infinite room for opponents (both well-intentioned and bad-faith actors) to make the case that voting for what you want will give you the opposite of that. This is the sad reality with most ballot questions (Prop 35 is another sad example).

When Prop J loses, some will accurately report it as a measure that lost its inherent support because it was crafted with implementation details that either would have caused significant harm, or at least left themselves open to that interpretation.

But most probably won't see it that way. Measure J's defeat will likely be widely reported as a rejection of an effort to prioritize animal rights, an affirmation of public support for the status quo in agriculture, and a distaste among the electorate for imposing substantive change on our agricultural industries. As if you had voted “no” on that simple question you're not being asked.

THAT is why Sonoma voters should vote for J. Because even if there are problems with the details and potential consequences (intended and otherwise), voting for J ***is*** voting for that North Star principle of improving how we treat animals and the planet, and untangling ourselves from a dehumanizing and destructive industrial scale agriculture. A vote for J is a vote for future laws, with more adeptly crafted details or perhaps even wisely avoiding them altogether, to put a chink in the armor of corporate-controlled factory farming in America. Let's set the precedence which can be used where it's most needed!

More on J:

Of course, it's complicated, any major policy shift always is. And yet the dire predictions of economic harms and the loss of historic multi-generation family farms, disregards the likely shifts towards smaller-scale more sustainable operations, including for those same family farms whose ancestral heritage they call upon were no doubt sustainable from their inception. For too long, our economic system has tilted the playing field in favor of ever larger agricultural production systems and businesses, as if concentrating animals, pollution, inputs (chemical and otherwise) and wealth is a good thing for the land, our bodies or our economy.

Don't believe the hype or the scare tactics. The corporate-controlled major agricultural industry in America has for decades controlled agriculturally-related policy-making at all levels, including how its reported and discussed, and has directly prevented the public from widely understanding the full breadth and depth of problems with factory farming, let alone the potential of more humane and sustainable alternatives.

A review of the Prop J debate: <https://www.pressdemocrat.com/article/news/measure-j-sonoma-county-farms-debate/>

KQED has reported at least 3 times on Measure J and hosted an hour-long radio call-in Forum show with a local family farmer and a rep. from Direct Action.

Sept. 27, "[Sonoma County's Measure J Could Reshape Farming](#)"

Oct. 21, "[Sonoma County's Measure J Could Reshape Farming](#)"

Oct. 22, "[Forum: Sonoma's Contentious Measure J Aims to Disrupt Meat Production](#)" featuring Mike Weber, Weber Family Farms, and Cassie King, Direct Action Everywhere Bay Area

Sonoma County's Northern California Public Media has reported on it in their "[Sonoma County First](#)" podcast reporting on it: Also, see some of their recent reporting on J here: [Election 2024: A last look at Measure J and the environment](#)

From KQED's Voter Guide:

Measure J would phase out existing farms and ban future farms designated as Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations. Existing operations would have 3 years to comply or face daily fines up to \$10,000. CAFO defined by federal regulations, though some details about the definition are in dispute. It would authorize civilian enforcement, and task the agricultural commissioner with implementation and management.

Yes Argument

CAFOs are inhumane to animals, who can feel emotions such as stress and fear. CAFOs are also detrimental for the environment due to their waste production, and exacerbate climate change with greenhouse gas emissions, such as methane from livestock. Affected CAFOs in the county — mostly egg, poultry and dairy farms — would not necessarily have to shut down, and could modify or downsize their operations to be in compliance.

No Argument

This measure would put out of business multigenerational family-owned farms, some of which have operated in the county for over 100 years. It would cause exponential job losses, higher food costs and less locally sourced eggs, milk and poultry; trucking these into the county would negate the measure's environmental goals. Its unfunded mandates would cost taxpayers millions, and the damage to the economy in Sonoma County — a historic agricultural region — has been estimated at \$500 million.

Healdsburg Measure O - YES

Should the city of Healdsburg allow multi-family housing along certain portions of Healdsburg Avenue?

Yes Argument

"For most of Healdsburg's middle-class residents the cost of housing is increasingly out of reach. By creating more housing options for local families, Measure O will ensure the people we rely on every day — teachers, nurses, peace officers, firefighters and essential workers who help make Healdsburg a

thriving community — can afford to live in the city they serve."

No Argument

"Healdsburg cannot sustain such growth. This would add to traffic, reduce parking and further tax our already limited resources, such as water. The measure would also change the small-town character of Healdsburg as it

excludes any single-family housing to be built in the designated areas yet allows unlimited ultra-luxury condos.”

Sebastopol Measure U - YES

Should the city of Sebastopol impose a 0.5% sales tax to fund general government purposes?

Sales taxes are regressive. True. What’s even more regressive? Austerity.

The inevitable cuts in municipal services that would result from Sebastopol’s failure to raise the sales tax will disproportionately harm lower income residents and less-resources, underserved, and otherwise disadvantaged communities in general. Disproportionate both relative to their more privileged neighbors, and to the benefits they’ll receive by avoiding 0.5% of a ~10% sales tax.

Yes, waste should be found and eliminated (as of course should corruption). But any benefits in that realm that could come from avoiding this sales tax height will likely be accompanied by real delays or limitations in useful projects and reduction or disruption of important services.

From KQED:

Yes Argument

“We have done our best to ‘live within our means,’ eliminating programs and deferring maintenance. Despite these efforts, our town faces a future of stagnant revenues and increasing expenses. This year’s shortfall is \$700,000. Without this sales tax increase, the projected deficit climbs to \$2 million or more annually, with city reserves depleted within three years. This new local revenue source can change that trajectory.”

No Argument

“If a half-cent sales tax passes, Sebastopol will have the highest sales tax in Sonoma County. Sebastopol will have California’s legal maximum at 10.25%. Council hiked water rates without a vote; vote No on this price hike. Increasing sales tax allows Council to take more money from people’s paychecks, disability and social security checks without addressing Sebastopol’s root problems. Keep your money in your pocket, vote No.”

Petaluma Measure Y - Yes

Should the city of Petaluma extend the term of the city’s Urban Growth Boundary, and modify the Urban Growth Boundary’s criteria re: transit oriented development?

Yes Argument

“The UGB minimizes the city’s environmental footprint and long-term infrastructure costs for roads & utilities, while promoting growth that benefits residents & local businesses, and assures that taxpayer and ratepayer dollars are spent efficiently and effectively. A Yes vote is a vote against sprawl, & an expression of support for meeting our housing goals with infill development that promotes alternative transportation models such as walking, biking, and public transit.”

No Argument: None filed.

[TOP](#)

CANDIDATES

US President:

I am hopeful that Kamala Harris will become the first female (finally!) president of the United States of America this January.

And oh, how I wish we had Ranked Choice Voting, so we could each vote our conscience, selecting as our first choice the person we REALLY wish were our next president, while simultaneously listing as our 2nd choice, our preference from among the major party candidates who have realistic chances of winning.

If you're thinking of voting for a 3rd party presidential candidate this year, California is a safe blue state. Kamala Harris will win CA. Consider participating with one of the organizations linking voters in safe states + swing states to boost swing state votes for Harris-Walz. Or just support efforts like [The Movement Voter Project](#) or other efforts to help swing-state Democrats up and down the ballot.

You can write-in any candidate's name for President.

US Senate: Adam Schiff, (D)

If only we had [ranked choice voting](#), we could have had Katie Porter or Barbara Lee as our next Senator. One more reason we need RCV (Richmond Voters: Vote Yes on L!).

Given the top-2 primary system we're stuck with for now, **Adam Schiff** is the only legit choice this cycle, and we may just be stuck with him for a generation. That said, he's immensely favorable to the non-experienced and conservative Steve Garvey. Since the Senate (like the House) is a strictly partisan institution, any vote for Garvey is a vote for whichever right-wing MAGA Republican will replace Mitch McConnell as Senate Republican leader this coming year. And there's a significant risk that MAGA person will be the Senate majority leader (don't let us down Montana!).

The chance of Garvey winning the California senate seat this election is close to zero, so don't lose sleep over this one. But why vote for him? Garvey has nothing to offer beyond his great reputation as a baseball star. Like Trump (and the vast majority of current Republicans), he promises to promote horrible right-wing policies that will take away civil liberties (except unfettered gun distribution), punish the poor, eviscerate public education, exacerbate our inequities + our climate crisis, etc. Anything bad that can be said about Schiff or Democrats in general pales in comparison to the damage Republicans say they will do. Believe them.

US Congress (CA-12): **Lateefah Simon** (replacing Barbara Lee)

(Cindy) Lateefah Simon is a longtime Bay Area justice organizer. She is great on criminal justice reform, labor, civil rights, public transportation, and disability rights (she herself is half-blind). She already has good relationships across CA, especially with Black electeds and others in D.C. (Kamala Harris was her mentor.) She's good people. [Her website](#) presents her strengths honestly.

Endorsed by Barbara Lee and many others

[Top](#)

State Senate

Note that State Senate Districts have changed for this election (along with State Assembly and US Congressional districts), based on 2020 redistricting. For example, if you're in Oakland, Alameda, Berkeley or Richmond, Nancy Skinner is your State Senator and you're in the current District 9. But starting with this election, your district (with minor border changes) will now be called District 7, and we recommend voting for Jovanka Beckles.

For all the new district boundaries, see this interactive map: <https://wedrawthelines.ca.gov/final-maps/>

District #7: **Jovanka Beckles**

(Oakland, Alameda, Berkeley, Richmond)

Note: *this is the race for the open seat replacing Nancy Skinner as Richmond/Berkeley/Oakland's state senator. This district is currently called "District 9", and the current "District 7" is Walnut Creek / Dublin / Pleasanton etc. After the 2020 redistricting, the new California map confusingly swaps the numbers on these districts, so that Walnut Creek will be #9 and Oakland / Berkeley / Richmond will be #7)*

California's state-government is not only entirely dominated by the Democratic Party, but by the wing of the party that is entirely controlled by industries and donors. The misperception (both here and nationwide) of California in General as a progressive hotbed badly skews our concepts of both where the political center in America is, and what policy changes are possible to improve life for everyone here. Especially since so many other states follow California's lead, the laws passed here matter deeply. Yes, our governor and Assembly / State Senate have advanced some important social progressive issues (reproductive rights, LGBTQ rights, etc.). But for decades they've offered mere lip-service to many other progressive priorities (improving education, eliminating inequality, guaranteeing housing and healthcare, protecting our environment). The East Bay does not need to add to the moderate voices conceding all these issues to the right wing. We can and should send a vocal advocate who will call BS on mainstream corporate-owned Democrats, and demand the real change that we need and that will be appreciated. That is Jovanka Beckles.

(Cindy/James) We have two friends who are organizers who have worked directly with Arreguin and have only very negative things to say about his integrity. Beckles is the most progressive, grassroots, doesn't take corporate money, and in this case identity politics for the win: Black, Latinx, lesbian.

Also endorsed by AC Greens, Our Revolution East Bay, East Bay DSA

District #9: Marisol Rubio

(Castro Valley, LaMorinda, Walnut Creek, Antioch)

Endorsed by AC Greens and Our Revolution East Bay

District #5: Jerry McNerney

(San Joaquin County-Livermore-Dublin-Pleasanton-Sunol)

Jerry McNerney is a former member of the US Congress, and should be elected to the California State Assembly this election. His only opposition is a Republican who will take the state in the wrong direction.

State Assembly Districts:

Just like the State Senate and US Congressional Districts, Assembly District #s have changed thanks to redistricting. See the note above and [this map](#).

Assembly District 14: Margot Smith (not Buffy Wicks!)

(Berkeley, Albany, El Cerrito, Richmond, Pinole, Hercules)

Wicks will win re-election. She is a great centrist who would be a fantastic representative in Sacramento from any one of California's swing districts, such as the one she grew up in in the Sierra foothills. But she has no business holding our seat in such a progressive district. She has been great on some issues like abortion rights, family leave, and some housing issues. But she was picked by the national democratic establishment to occupy our assembly seat and prevent a real progressive voice from being seated in Sacramento. She previously had no experience. She has been terrible on a range of issues, preventing the needle from being moved significantly on environmental, economic, health care, or a range of other important issues. And locally, she's been horrible on issues related to Cal, essentially amplifying UC's talking points and their disingenuous dealings with the City of Berkeley and other neighbors, buying into their black-and-white "let us do whatever we want or you're hurting the poor minority first-generation college applicants!" dishonest dichotomy. She aids and abets UC's pretense of zero responsibility as if all conflicts are irrelevant or invented, instead of engaging with them responsibly, and promoting reasonable solutions. And it's not as if she's even pushing hard to get more funding for them either.

Margot Smith is far more progressive, doesn't take corporate money, and even though she won't beat Wicks, a vote for her is a vote to remind Wicks not to dismiss her constituents' concerns nor take us for granted. Your vote for Smith is a vote for a legit challenge to Wicks in the future.

Assembly District 15: Anamarie Avila Farías?

Martinez, Concord, Clayton, Antioch, Pittsburg, Brentwood

Anamarie Avila Farías is endorsed by Courage California in the race to replace Tim Grayson (D) who is giving up his seat to run for a vacant CA State Senate seat.

Not a lot of love for either Avila Farias or the other candidate (both Dems), Sonia Ledo. [Contra Costa News says](#):

"It's pretty sad these were the two candidates that made it through the primary and if these are the best two the district has to offer, it has to give one pause and at least question what in the world is going on."

Assembly District 16: Rebecca Bauer-Kahan

(LaMorinda, Walnut Creek, Danville, San Ramon, Mt. Diablo SP)

Rebecca Bauer-Kahan is endorsed by [Courage California](#).

Assembly District 18: Mia Bonta

(Oakland, Alameda, Emeryville)

Mia Bonta is already a political juggernaut, and will win re-election, with the endorsements of both the Democratic Party establishment and most progressive orgs, which she inherited from her husband who she replaced in this seat when Newsom appointed him Attorney General in 2021, and which she's continued to earn in her own right since then.

Assembly District 20: Liz Ortega

(San Leandro, Hayward, Castro Valley, Union City)

Liz Ortega should be re-elected to the Assembly this year. Her only opposition is a Republican who will take the state in the wrong direction.

[Top](#)

Alameda County Board of Supervisors

AC Supervisor, District 5 [Nikki Fortunato Bas](#)

North Oakland, Piedmont, Berkeley, Emeryville, Albany

Bas is the Oakland City Council President. Experienced, committed progressive.

[Endorsed](#) by most progressive organizations, unions, and individuals as well as a wide range of mainstream groups and officials too.

Endorsed in essentially all of the voter guides I align with: AC Greens, Our Revolution East Bay, East Bay DSA, Wellstone Club, etc.

Her opponent is [John Bauters](#), Emeryville City Councilmember. Bauters is also [endorsed](#) by many mainstream democratic organizations and individuals as well as some progressives.

I believe that District 5 is the only seat on the ballot this election cycle. The fact that it's this hard to find conclusive clarity on even which seats do voters have options on is a serious indictment of the way we conduct elections for our county leadership.

AC Supervisor, District 1

Dublin, Livermore, Sunol, Fremont

AC Supervisor, District 2

Hayward, Union City

AC Supervisor, District 3

Alameda, central Oakland (Jack London, east of Lake Merritt, Fruitvale), San Leandro

AC Supervisor, District 4

East Oakland, Ashland, Cherryland, Castro Valley, Pleasanton

Oakland Recall Attempts:

District Attorney (Pamela Price) - **NO!**

Mayor (Sheng Thao) - **NO!**

Whatever your opinions on Price and/or Thao, both of these recalls are yet more attempts to undo elections, and undermine our electoral process, turning 4-year terms into 2-year terms when a well-funded party doesn't get their preferred candidate to win on the first try. Like other recent recalls, these are at their core sore-loser campaigns started right after the last election, and well-funded by national right-wing organizations and individuals.

Neither of them have done anything remotely fitting the original intent of a recall: to protect us from corrupt officials who violate their oath of office. Perhaps the worst critique against Price, for example, is for nepotism which while it certainly should be condemned and ended, isn't as severe as the nepotism of her predecessor, which met nary a whisper for years from the now-righteously-outraged recall organizers.

And even if you feel like these two elected officials are leading us in the wrong direction, just consider the example of San Francisco's District Attorney. Voters in SF were swayed by a similar, well-funded sore-loser scare and smear campaign, and they voted to recall Chesa

Boudin in 2022. Mayor Breed promptly replaced him with Brooke Jenkins, a classic “tough on crime” prosecutor, who had worked on the recall campaign herself. Ask anyone in San Francisco just how much the city has improved over the past 2 years, in terms of crime and safety.

If you're still on the fence, please understand that a vote for either of these recalls is a vote for more recalls in the future. Perhaps you've noticed that in the past few years, there's been an increasing rash of recalls. Multi-millionaires like hedge-fund manager Philip Dreyfuss, who paid most of the costs for Thao's recall, might have bottomless pockets to redo elections when they don't like the results, but our local governments don't, and these significantly draining the limited time, people-power and other resources, as well as distracting the very government officials they complain aren't focused enough on solving our problems.

There has been no crime committed nor other corruption worthy of a recall. This is NOT a sincere democratic process, and neither of these recalls will make anything better in Oakland. Either of them WILL make our electoral politics worse if they pass, let alone both.

Please take a stand against this.

[Top](#)

AC Transit

See the [AC Transit District Maps](#) to see which district you're in:

Ward 1 (Albany, El Cerrito, Richmond, El Soberano)

Ward 2 (West Oakland, Emeryville and Berkeley)

Ward 6 (Hayward, Newark, West Fremont): **Jesse Gunn**

BART Director:

The fact that there's only one competitive race for four (or is it 5?) open seats this electoral season raises the question of whether it makes sense to keep BART board members as elected positions at all.

The lack of published info about BART director candidates, especially those running unopposed, including the absence of a candidate list on BART's website suggests opposition from within the org to the democratic representational nature of their own governance. Same with AC Transit. I would strongly support a future ballot measure to convert both boards to appointed positions, since they seem to mostly operate that way anyways.

After weeks of failing to find info in districts 1 and 3, I finally tumbled up on this Mercury News editorial (in a random Twitter post), explaining that both feature unopposed lone candidates.

<https://www.mercurynews.com/2024/09/28/endorsement-bart-dana-lang-fiscal-cliff-election-editorial/>

And even in their editorial, they note how impossible it's been for them, a major news org, to find ANY info about some candidates.

District map: <https://www.bart.gov/about/bod/districts>

District 1 - **Matt Rinn (unopposed)**

(LaMorinda, Walnut Creek, Pleasant Hill, Clayton, Blackhawk)

District 3 - **Barnali Ghosh**

(Berkeley, Richmond, San Pablo, Hercules, Crockett)

District 5 - **Melissa Hernández**

(Hayward downtown + hills, Castro Valley, Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore)

[Melissa Hernández](#) is the incumbent (appointed) BART director who resigned as mayor of Dublin to take this spot

Her opponent is [Joe Grcar](#), retired laboratory scientist and perennial candidate for office. He's simultaneously running for 3 other positions, including a seat on the Cabot - Las Positas Community College Board of Trustees.

District 7 - **Victor Flores**

(downtown Oakland, West Oakland and North Oakland):

District 9 - **Edward Wright**

(SF: downtown, SoMa, Tenderloin, Western Addition, Hayes, Castro, Noe, Mission, Mission Bay, Dogpatch, Potrero, Bernal, Vis Valley, Glen Park, Excelsior):

Endorsed by the [Working Families Party](#)

East Bay Regional Park District Directors:

District map: <https://www.ebparks.org/sites/default/files/maps/District-Map-wardmap-2020-19x17.pdf>

Ward 1: Elizabeth Echols is unopposed in her run for re-election to Ward 1 EBRPD (Berkeley - Richmond - Pinole) = Albany, El Cerrito, Hercules, Richmond, East Richmond Heights, San Pablo, Bayview-Montalvin, El Sobrante, Kensington, North Richmond, Rollingwood, and Tara Hills. Also most of Berkeley, part of Emeryville, a little of North Oakland.

Ward 2: Lynda Deschambault

(Oakland - Orinda - Pleasant Hill) = Most of Oakland, plus Piedmont, Moraga, Orinda, Lafayette, Acalanes Ridge, Alamo, Castle Hill, Saranap, and Waldon. Also a corner of Berkeley, parts of Emeryville, Pleasant Hill, Walnut Creek, and Reliez Valley.

Lynda is a long-time EPA environmental scientist with substantial experience in creating/managing parks and open spaces, specifically with EBRPD (6 years on their

advisory committee) and in other major leadership positions (councilmember and mayor of Moraga).

Other candidates include:

Casey Farmer - an Oakland unified Sp.Ed. teacher with experience working in the office of elected officials, and the endorsement of an impressive swath of the local Democratic party establishment and the Wellstone Democratic Committee

Shane Reisman - Lafayette parks commissioner.

Ward 4:

(Alameda - San Leandro - Hayward) = Alameda, East Oakland, San Leandro, Ashland, Cherryland, San Lorenzo, and parts of Hayward and Castro Valley.

East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD)

EBMUD District 1: **Joey Smith** (SWITCHED FROM EARLIER SUGGESTION)

Both Anthony Tave and [Joey Smith](#) have solid technical expertise and experience, and both credibly promise to prioritize securing our safe and effective water system in a changing environment.

Smith has more relevant experience as an EBMUD technician. One of Smith's colleagues tells me: *"Joey D Smith has a lot more experience with EBMUD, having worked with them for 30+ years as a water conservation technician and has a lot of endorsements. See her website: <https://www.joeydsmithforwater.org/>".*

I believe this is the same Anthony Tave who is currently a Pinole City Councilmember (first elected in 2018, re-elected in 2022).

Tave apparently does not have a campaign website, and I can't find any info on him beyond his candidate statement, in which he promises to bring a broader perspective with a bold vision for significant steps that EBMUD can take to proactively address the threats we face, and to be a part of the solution to their underlying causes.

Initially, that sounded good enough to suggest voting for Tave. But have the absence of a campaign website or other info on Tave pointed out, as well as the invitation to give Smith a longer look, suggest that in fact Smith is the better option for this EBMUD seat.

From KQED

(<https://www.kqed.org/voterguide/contracosta/district-races#east-bay-municipal-utility-district-director-ward-1>):

Anthony L. Tave

- Pinole City Council Member/civil engineer

- **Climate Change:** “As rate-payers, we must be prepared for the effects of climate change on our infrastructure and the environment.”
- **Priorities:** “Protecting our clean water. Initiating innovative conservation and renewable energy programs that address the effects of climate change. Financial stewardship to protect rate-payers. Investing in innovative recycled water projects.”
- **Infrastructure:** “We need partnerships to help EBMUD invest in advanced technologies and secure funding for infrastructure improvements, so we can ensure a resilient water supply.”

Joey D. Smith

- Water conservation technician
- **Priorities:** “I’m running to be your EBMUD director to keep your water rates reasonable, protect our high-quality water supply, improve our infrastructure, protect EBMUD’s valuable watershed lands, improve our water system’s ability to fight wildfires and withstand major earthquakes, and make EBMUD responsive to customers.”
- **Experience:** “As a dedicated EBMUD employee for 30+ years, I’ve focused on providing our West County communities the best possible water service.”
- **Water Rates:** “I want to be your representative in providing reliable, high-quality water services at reasonable rates while being a good steward for the resources entrusted to us.”
- www.joeydsmithforwater.org

EBMUD District 5: Jim Oddie

[Jim Oddie](#) is the establishment candidate on this, but solid experience will be a plus for effective governance of our water utility, and even for the positive changes we’d like to see. As “a former City of Alameda Councilmember and former District Director for then-Assemblymember (now Attorney General) Rob Bonta,” he has first-hand experience with both a wide range of water-related issues, as well as functioning of major public institutions

Oddie has the recommendation of the District 5 director he would replace, as well as the Wellstone Club.

[Alex Spehr](#) appears to be the outsider, the community garden volunteer who appears to be approaching this as an activist, eager to keep rate increases low, while improving climate resilience. However, his own website does not convey much confidence in an effective approach to maintaining the water supply for several million people, let alone implementing the positive ideals he professes.

AC Greens recommends Spehr, with reservations

Other candidates include:

[John Lewis](#), construction manager

EBMUD District 6: Valerie Lewis

Running against [Richard de Vera](#), entrepreneur

Alameda County Water District (ACWD) - Ward 5: Aziz Akbari

[Top](#)

Oakland City Council:

Oakland City Council takes on new importance given the possibility that Mayor Sheng Thao might be recalled (yet ANOTHER reason to vote NO on the recall!)

[According to Oaklandside](#), if Thao is recalled, then at some unspecified time after the election is certified, she'll be removed from office. At that point, Council President is supposed to become temporary Mayor, until a special election is called. But by then, the current Council President (Nikki Fortunato Bas) will likely be stepping down to take the new County Council seat she's running for (and favored to win). In that case, the Councilmember Pro Tempore is next in line to become mayor. But that's Dan Kalb, and by then he'll ALSO be stepping down, since he chose to run for the State Senate instead of re-election to his City Council seat. So there might not be anyone in line to replace Thao. In that case, the City Council will have to elect one of their own to step in as temporary mayor. So keep that in mind when choosing your City Council member.

(recommendations following advice from both AC Greens and OREB)

At-Large: #1: **Charlene Wang**; #2: **Rowena Brown**

(Wellstone Democratic Club recommends same two in reverse order: #1: Brown; #2 Wang)

Replacing Reb Kaplan for our at-large City Council position are two great candidates.

Charlene Wang works for the US EPA, and has a wealth of experience and connections bringing federal funding for local green jobs, renewable energy and environmental justice projects. She has a vision of making Oakland a sustainable energy hub, and the cred to make

that a reality. She has the endorsement of our outgoing Councilmember Dan Kalb, himself a champion on environmental issues.

Rowena Brown has a wealth of experience working for both the City Council and the State Govt, and has the endorsements of Reb as well as Rob & Mia Bonta (who she worked for), plus numerous unions and other local progressive heavyweights. Her roots in the community and her connections with local & state govt could help make real progress on some key issues (housing, homelessness, policing, etc.)

District 1: #1: Zac Unger; #2: Edward Frank

District 3: **Carroll Fife**

Local progressive hero who has gained national attention. She launched “Moms for Housing,” and has been a tireless activist fighting for rights of tenants and homeless people, and to resolve our homelessness and housing crises (she was homeless herself for a period of time).

See:

<https://www.motherjones.com/politics/2020/10/carroll-fife-moms-4-housing-oakland-city-council-black-panther-radical-legacy/>

District 5: Erin Armstrong

District 7: #1: Iris Merriouns; #2: Merika Goolsby

Oakland School Board:

For a map of OUSD School Board Districts, see: <https://gisapps1.mapoakland.com/ousd/>

(endorsements per AC Greens, OREB and Wellstone Dem Renewal Club)

District 1: **Rachel Latta**

District 3: **VanCedric Williams**

District 5: **Sasha Ritzie-Hernandez**

District 7: **Domonic Ware**

Per Wellstone. AC Greens only says “Don’t vote for Thompson”

Oakland City Attorney

Ryan Richardson is the Chief Assistant City Attorney and is running against a retired judge, Brenda Harbin-Forte. She recently entered the race just to try to keep him out of office because Richardson is a true progressive, going after banks, chemical companies and landlords who break the law, whereas Harbin-Forte is leading the attempted recalls of other Oakland officials because they are progressive, too. This is an easy choice, **vote for Richardson**.

Peralta Community College District Area 2: Paulina Gonzalez-Brito

Endorsed by both AC Greens and the Wellstone Democratic Renewal Club

For a map of Peralta Community College Districts, see: <https://www.peralta.edu/boardoftrustees/redistricting>

Top

Berkeley Mayor:

This one has been tough to sort out since the beginning of the race. Three major candidates ([Sophie Hahn](#), [Kate Harrison](#) and [Adena Ishii](#)) take similar stances in support of increasing affordable housing, support for homeless people, addressing climate change, improving infrastructure and both safety and police accountability, and other shared goals we all seem to agree on. On many of these key issues, we've struggled to see real daylight between the candidates.

I encourage Berkeley voters to take a look at what each of these 3 has said and done and decide for yourself who you prefer.

We like what we've read and heard from/about **Adena Ishii**. Her status as an outsider without Berkeley local governance experience seems like a plus rather than a liability as some portray it, given some of the ways that City Governance seems stuck, including the resignation of 2 City Councilmembers in the past year (one of them being Kate Harrison).

And Ishii does have a wide range of experience working directly on many of key local issues, including as president of the local League of Women Voters. She's worked on commissions implementing city policies including both the soda tax, and creating reparations recommendations for Berkeley schools. She's worked in multiple district attorney offices, and has both an MBA and a law degree.

Although AC Greens labels Ishii as "the most conservative candidate" in this race, her actual statements and proposals don't seem to fit that. Their specific critiques seem more nitpicking than identifying actual policy differences. Endorsements from Buffy Wicks and other DNC conservatives however does raise some red flags that AC Greens might be right in that assessment.

Kate Harrison has the enthusiastic endorsement of most progressive organizations, including the voter guides I align most closely with: Alameda County Greens, Our Revolution East Bay,

Wellstone Democratic Club and others. AC Greens and Wellston both laud her long experience and commitment to advancing on key issues of affordable housing, carbon emission reduction, addressing violence and racism in the Berkeley police force and more. ACG notably advises against even ranking any other candidate, and particularly commends Harrison's "sound management skills honed over her career."

However, a few of Harrison's actions have raised questions for us. She [resigned from her City Council seat](#) just this past January saying "*Berkeley's processes are broken and I cannot in good conscience continue to serve on this body*". Now, less than 9 months later, she's running to lead that same City Govt. As mayor, she'll need to collaborate with that same City Council, and I haven't heard a good explanation for why she won't feel stymied by those same broken processes as Mayor.

One friend who helped co-host a forum for all 3 candidates says: "*One main conclusion that I came away with is that Kate Harrison is not temperamentally suited to be mayor. She is quite brilliant and has some great policy positions. She also appeared angry for much of the evening and did not interact well with the over 100 attendees. Both Sophie Hahn and Adena Ishii have more grace and I strongly believe that matters.*"

Some like **Sophie Hahn** for her progressive stance on a wide range of issues. Hahn has perhaps the [longest list of endorsements](#) in this race including [outgoing Mayor Jesse Arreguin](#) and most of her fellow City Councilmembers as well as many other state and local officials and .orgs.

AC Greens call Hahn "the establishment, status quo candidate who generally followed Arreguin's lead during her seven years on Council."

One other criticism some people have levied towards Hahn is that she helped Arreguin block any City Council resolution supporting a ceasefire between Israel and Hamas. For many people, however, it probably felt like a relief that Berkeley avoided the divisive chaos unleashed at Oakland City Council meetings, which created significant divisions and harm in the city while diverting entire meetings with no significant positive outcomes.

People who don't like local governments spending time/attention on international politics in general probably applaud Hahn's move. Personally, I often appreciate the City of Berkeley taking a strong stand for peace, justice and freedom here and abroad. I would have loved to see a strong, empathetic, inclusive statement on the war in Gaza and its impact on Berkeley residents. But the criticism of Hahn for blocking any such resolution is tempered (for me) by the lack of confidence that a resolution from this city council (and the process of public input on it) would have been less ugly, divisive, hate-filled, and counterproductive than Oakland's.

See also:

Summary of a Berkeley Mayor candidates forum:

<https://www.berkeleyside.org/2024/07/25/berkeley-mayoral-candidate-forum>

Berkeley Mayor Candidates' official statements:

<https://www.kqed.org/voterguide/alameda/berkeley#mayor>

Berkeley City Council - see [Berkeley City Council District Map](#)

(per AC Greens)

District 2: Jenny Guarino

District 3: 1 - John "Chip" Moore; 2: Ben Bartlett

District 5: Nilang Gor

District 6: Andy Katz

Berkeley School Board: **Ana Vasudeo** and **Jen Corn**

<https://www.berkeleyside.org/2024/09/30/berkeley-school-board-election-2024>

https://www.dailycal.org/news/city/local-schools/meet-the-candidates-for-berkeley-unified-school-district-school-board/article_418e982a-6689-11ef-8321-b315fdaef501.html

Ana Vasudeo is the incumbent board president. Jen Corn, is a former Berkeley teacher and principal, whose priority seems to be resetting funding priorities in an age of school budget cuts, with an emphasis on transparency and inclusion in the process of setting those priorities. Laura Babbitt is (like Vasudeo) an incumbent current school board member who states as one of her priorities "to address bullying and implicit bias across the district".

Progressive groups endorse Jen Corn to replace Babbitt, echoing the teachers and staff unions endorsements of Corn. I couldn't find any published rationale for that preference. AC Greens give more praise to Babbitt than Corn in their attempt to explain why they are endorsing Corn over Babbitt. So for weeks, I supported keeping Babbitt instead of replacing her with Corn, because I simply wasn't seeing the rationale to remove a sitting board member (esp. a successful woman of color).

It took several weeks of discussions with a number of my former BUSD colleagues and other friends and acquaintances who still teach or do other work in Berkeley Schools to finally change my mind on that. One friend said Babbitt's push to reopen schools too soon in the pandemic had been problematic. Another said Babbitt also ruffled feathers by not signing on to a letter of support when the superintendent testified before Congress. Some related additional stories of concern about actions Laura Babbitt had taken, the tone she set, or about the current board in general. I heard enough stories to help me understand the calls for changing the Berkeley School board.

And universally, everyone I spoke with or heard from was enthusiastic about Jen Corn. They know her as a colleague, as a teacher, a principal, an educator, a leader. From my fellow teachers, I hear a broad aspiration for an empathetic perspective that seems lacking on the current board.

Ana Vasudeo is the incumbent School Board President. All the unions and other progressive orgs support re-electing Vasudeo, but again are not very clear or expressive in their rationale. I haven't heard much directly about her, but apparently the critiques of the current board aren't attributed to her as much as to Babbitt, nor have I heard criticism of personal actions she's taken as is the case with Babbitt.

Berkeley Rent Stabilization Board: **Alfred Twu**, Xavier Johnson, Avery Arbaugh and Dominique Walker

Alfred Twu is a long time activist and engaged participant in local governance, he's run for several other local offices before. He brings

tremendous creativity, a knack for humanizing complex policy issues, and a genuine interest in hearing people's perspectives, insights and opinions.

I haven't met any of the others, nor do I know much about them, I'm simply following the seemingly unanimous endorsement for this slate of 4 from progressive groups, and glad Alfred is among them.

The entire slate is endorsed by a wide range of progressive groups including AC Greens, OREB, WFP, and others.

[Top](#)

Alameda City Council: **Michelle Pryor**

Endorsed by OREB

Albany City Council:

(Per AC greens)

#1: Peggy McQuaid; #2: Aaron Tiedemann; #3: Preston Jordan; #4: Jennifer Hansen-Romero

Albany School Board: **Jolene Gazman**

Endorsed by both OREV and AC Greens, who also says #2: Brian Doss

[Top](#)

Hayward City Council:

Meet the individuals who have qualified for the November 5, 2024 Election:

<https://www.hayward-ca.gov/your-government/elections/candidate-information>

Voters choose 4 from among the 7 candidates (including 4 incumbents, each noted with a *):

* [Angela Andrews](#), councilmember, Hayward

* [Ray Bonilla](#), Jr., appointed councilmember, Hayward

[Tom Ferreira](#), emergency medical technician

“Grassroots candidate,” focused on public safety, affordable housing, attracting businesses, creating a “family destination”

* [Daniel Goldstein](#), appointed councilmember, Hayward

[Joe Ramos](#), trustee, Hayward USD

Ramos is also running for [re-election to the HUSD School Board](#) at the same time as running for a seat on City Council.

[Tom Wong](#), businessman

Like Ramos, Wong is double-dipping: running for seats on both [the HUSD School Board](#) and City Council at the same time.

Wong lists his priorities as Police, Fire, Fight against crime, Homelessness and drug addiction, pathway to home ownership, and lower taxes

* Francisco Zermeño, councilmember, Hayward

Zermeño seems to be the only candidate without a campaign website. He does have a [LinkedIn](#) page. And you can check out his [official profile](#) on the City of Hayward page.

The [East Bay Times editorial page](#) recommends re-electing the 4 incumbents (Andrews, Bonilla, Goldstein and Zermeño)

Three of the Incumbent councilmembers ([Andrews](#), [Bonilla](#), and [Goldstein](#)) are all endorsed by Mayor Mark Salinas, every other councilmember, Congressman Eric Swalwell and a wide range of local and national Democratic Party officials and orgs.

The East Bay Times is the only endorsement I found for Zermeño.

I couldn't find any endorsements for the non-incumbents (Ferreira, Goldstein or Wong).

Hayward School Board: [Austin Bruckner-Carrillo](#)

Per OREB and WFP

Austin is [endorsed](#) by a long list of local, state and federal elected officials (Mayor Salinas, Congressman Ro Khanna, Assemblymember Mia Bonta), as well as many unions and other .orgs and leaders.

Chabot-Las Positas CC Board

See <https://districtazure.clpccd.org/bot/area-map.php>

CLPCC Board of Trustees Area 1: ???

(Downtown Hayward, Hayward Highland)

Luis Reynoso (incumbent)

[Hector Garcia](#) (public school educator, 30-years experience)

CLPCC Board of Trustees Area 4: **Maria Heredia**

(Pleasanton, Palomares)

Maria's opponent is Joe Grcar, aretired laboratory scientist and perennial candidate for office. He's simultaneously running for a seat on the BART Board of directors.

Contra Costa County Board of Education Area 1: Anthony Caro

El Cerrito City Council (pick 3): **Rebecca Saltzman**, Lisa Motoyama, Courtney Helion

Rebecca Saltzman did a good job in general as a member of the BART board of directors, she was responsive and helped usher in some positive developments and policy shifts. She did take one action that still looks wrong today (hopefully she can acknowledge it as a mistake): her defense of the decision to install those metal and glass canopies over the stairway entrances to BART without a roof on them, so they still let rain fall on the stairs.

Richmond City Council

(per OREB and WFP)

District 1: Melvin Willis

District 5: Ahmad Anderson

District 6: Claudia Jimenez

San Francisco Mayor: [Aaron Peskin](#)

[Courage Campaign](#) notes:

Supervisor Aaron Peskin's track record and policy positions demonstrate that he will be a progressive voice for the constituents of San Francisco and will govern effectively in the best interest of this diverse city.... The only progressive choice in this race.

[Other endorsements for Peskin](#) include:

SF Berniecrats, SF Rising, San Francisco Tenants Union, San Francisco Women's Political Committee, Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club, California Working Families Party, Bay Rising Action, many labor unions, State Assemblymember Phil Ting, SF Supervisor Connie Chan, SF Supervisor Dean Preston, and former State Assemblymember Tom Ammiano.

Plenty of reasons to seek a change from Mayor Breed's tenure.

Among other candidates for SF Mayor:

[Mark Farrell](#) is scandal plagued (esp. With campaign finances)

[Daniel Lurie](#) is an intriguing outsider bringing "fresh ideas". But his lack of experience may be a legit hindrance in this case, and his campaign seems to be an attempt to buy the mayorship as a Levi heir.

SF Board of Supervisors:

(as they call the City Council, perhaps because SF County = City of SF)

Per the endorsements of [SF Rising](#), [Working Families Party](#), [Courage Campaign](#), & [SF Berniecrats](#) which all agree on the following (although they don't all list 2nd choices for D9 and D11):

District 1: **Connie Chan**

District 3: **Sharon Lai**

District 5: **Dean Preston**

District 7: **Myrna Melgar**

District 9: **Jackie Fielder** (rank as #2: Stephen Torres)

District 11: **Chyanne Chen** (#2: Ernest Jones)

[Top](#)

This electoral guide was developed in collaboration with **James Ryder, Cindy McPherson, and Daniella Salzman**. HUGE thanks to all 3 of you for putting in your time and energy, and sharing your research, writing and input!!

And thank you to everyone else who continues to share your insights, resources and opinions with me. Whether I include anything you say here or not, it's all VERY helpful!

I live in a part of Oakland that's within Berkeley (some serious irony in having to write my voter registration address as "Berkeley" on the sealed envelope containing my Oakland ballot!). I teach [high](#)

[school in Hayward](#) while also working for [a small nonprofit in San Francisco](#). (Because what teacher can live in the Bay Area on just one salary?) I used to teach in Lafayette, Richmond, SF, Berkeley, and East Oakland. So I vote in Oakland while following the politics in all these cities and counties, and the broader Bay Area in general.

This is a Google Doc. Shorter version of the link to this doc: <https://shorturl.at/IOheI>

Feel free to share and PLEASE comment on it (click on a section you want to comment on, then click Insert => Comment).

Or email me: sustainablefred@gmail.com

Thank you, and good luck to us all!

- Fred Werner

[Top](#)