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Candidates' Statements
UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE
Thirteenth Congressional District

Marilyn M. Singleton
Occupation: Physician
My education and qualifications are: I’ve spent my life learning, teaching, and as a physician, healing. Working in health law advocacy, I solved problems, not pointed fingers. I’m a longtime East Bay resident concerned about persistent unemployment, wasteful government spending, and high student dropout rates. I’m not a career politician beholden to divisive special interest groups. To give value for our tax dollars, I’ll work to stop corporate handouts, consolidate overlapping agencies, and enhance retirement security by improving Medicare and Social Security. I’ll promote social programs that empower. Many existing programs do not foster self-respect. They treat symptoms, not the cause. Poorly educated – and many times fatherless – children become jobless adults with little respect for themselves or others. We can have stronger communities with more opportunities. I can help make it happen. Locally-based innovations can give all children access to a quality education. A culture of achievement promotes self-reliance, social responsibility, and leads to good jobs. Jobs promote safe secure communities and yield more tax revenues. To create jobs, I’ll work to bring home money parked overseas by taking the guesswork out of running businesses: simplify tax codes and eliminate ineffective regulations. Washington’s policymaking lessens the power and influence of communities. We want results, not politics as usual. I’ll span differences by putting common sense above “party line.” More unites us than divides us. I’m a new voice working hard to earn your vote. With your support, I’ll take my nonpartisan, no-nonsense, can-do attitude to Washington. We owe our children and ourselves brighter futures. www.SingletonForCongress.org.

Barbara Lee
Occupation: Member of Congress
My education and qualifications are: I am proud to live in the East Bay, the most culturally diverse and vibrant place in California. And as your representative in Congress, I have worked to advance policies that promote equity and economic and social justice. But we live in challenging times. Our economy remains stagnant, with too many of our neighbors out of work; healthcare costs and medical access are a crisis; higher education is beyond the reach of many families; and, the war in Afghanistan continues to divert national resources from urgent needs at home. I am doing my best to address these challenges in the halls of the United States Congress, prioritizing legislation that promotes pathways out of poverty and opportunities for all; implementing economic and socially-just policies that foster peace, and securing increased funding for community health centers. From my seat on the House Appropriations Committee, I leveraged dollars to make our streets safer, our schools stronger, and our economy more robust. I will continue to fight to grow our economy and put people back to work; to protect the environment and focus on the challenge of climate change; to ensure that all Americans have access to healthcare; and, to finally end the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. I hope I have earned your continued trust and that you will elect me to proudly serve you again in the Congress. Thank you. www.barbaraleeforcongress.org.
Candidates’ Statements
UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE
Fifteenth Congressional District

ERIC SWALWELL
Occupation: Prosecutor/City Councilman
Age: 31
My education and qualifications are: America needs an economic comeback. Unfortunately, Congress is a mess. Legislators spend too much time bickering over partisan politics, and too little time working for you. You deserve better. I’ll work with both parties to find solutions to our nation’s problems and lift the economic fortunes of our families. We need a Representative who actually lives in our community, won’t miss votes, and has the energy and new ideas to solve problems. As a Dublin City Councilman, I reformed the city’s pension plan to meet our commitments to retirees while balancing the budget without layoffs or service cuts. In Congress, I’ll end wasteful spending and reduce our debt. With a champion in Congress, our community can create thousands of new, high-tech and renewable energy jobs. We can deliver a tax code that encourages “Made in America,” no longer rewards companies who send jobs overseas, and makes the super-rich pay their fair share. I will also protect Medicare and Social Security and promote access to higher education. I’ll work to restore faith and accountability in Congress. I’ve prosecuted thousands of cases, was the county’s hate crimes prosecutor and received a community award from Mothers Against Drunk Drivers. I am endorsed by police and deputy sheriffs. I know the people and issues of our area. I’ve volunteered as a youth soccer coach, founded an education organization, and serve as an advisor to the Tri-Valley Conservancy, a land conservation group. I’ll never forget where I come from and who I represent, you. www.swalwellforcongress.com

FORTNEY PETE STARK
Occupation: U.S. Congressman
My education and qualifications are: My experience will deliver every day for the residents of the 15th Congressional District. That’s why I’ve earned the endorsements of President Obama and Senator Dianne Feinstein. With so many people in need of jobs, health care, education, public safety and transportation – I’ll be on the frontlines fighting for you. I’ve brought innovation in medical technology, green jobs, high-tech training, and millions of dollars in investments to every part of this District. No one can get these results without years of experience. I’ve championed the needs of the East Bay in Congress, leading the fight to protect Social Security and Medicare, preserve the environment, advocate for a woman’s right to choose, promote peace, and standing up for working families. As Chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Health, I helped craft President Obama’s groundbreaking Affordable Care Act – allowing young adults to get coverage on a parent’s plan until age 26; ending the ability of insurers to deny coverage for pre-existing conditions; and guaranteeing affordable, quality healthcare for all Americans. My greatest pleasure is helping people solve problems large and small. From finding a lost Social Security check to helping with veterans’ concerns, I’m committed to serving you. I’m an Air Force veteran. An MIT graduate with a business degree from U.C. Berkeley. And a father of seven and grandfather of eight – so I understand the importance of family and community. Tough times aren’t the right time to put a rookie in Congress. I humbly ask for your vote. www.petestark.com
Candidates’ Statements
UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE
Seventeenth Congressional District

MIKE HONDA
Occupation: Member of Congress
My education and qualifications are: Since I was first elected to Congress in 2000, I have been honored to represent an increasingly diverse, engaged and innovative constituency throughout Silicon Valley. However, I have also seen America become increasingly polarized and divided, hampering our collective ability to solve our nation’s toughest challenges: ensuring economic recovery, meeting each child’s educational needs, investing in infrastructure, and ensuring access to healthcare. I have and will continue to bring not only a deep knowledge of and commitment to my district, but also an ability to bridge the divide for solutions to what may seem politically unsolvable. These qualities are important to the task of rebuilding this country and confidence in Washington. As a senior Representative on the House Budget and Appropriations Committees, it has been my duty and honor to reinvest hundreds of millions of our own hard-earned taxpayer dollars back into our neighborhoods, bringing home our fair share of federal funds. My lifetime of service to our community is consistent and clear. As an educator of 30 years; a parent and grandparent; a Peace Corps volunteer in El Salvador; a federal, state and local legislator; and an internee during World War II, I know that while government can make mistakes, it can also work to ensure access to the American promise for all. I pledge to continue representing local families by working everyday to reinvigorate our economy nationally as well as locally, so that we can all reach and expand the American Dream.

EVELYN LI
Occupation: Medical Doctor
Age: 56
My education and qualifications are: My book: What Makes Sense, www.evelynli.org, outlines my plans: Healthcare Innovative Reform Bill Proposal, Production Innovation Increase Job Bill Proposal and Immigration Support USA Bill Proposal. (Cut taxes for all sectors, streamline government spending, bring jobs back to America, reform healthcare, promote pursuit of excellence, adopt two-tier immigration systems, restore the constitution of America, and bring God back to Congress) I can help you rebuild America. The USA was once the world’s leader in innovation and can be again. We have resources that are the envy of the world. We have Silicon Valley once known as the technology cutting edge. We have the highest number of Nobel Prize winners. We have the best universities. With the right laws, the right government along with the right leaders, we can rebuild America. We will put integrity, accountability, transparency and frugality back into Congress and restore America’s confidence in our future. “I admire your courage, talent, and integrity. You did it once when you took on an entire hospital administration. You risked everything to do what you felt was the right thing.” Robert Weinmann, MD, Editor of www.politicsofhealthcare.com, Founder of the Union of the American Physicians and Dentists. I am a cardiologist, a mother, and a founder of multiple non-profit Organizations. I have successfully helped change laws to benefit our disadvantaged such as postponing Medicare cuts and strengthening patients’ right. I respectfully ask for your vote this November. Vote Evelyn Li for Congress, 17th Congressional District. Thank you.
MARK DESAULNIER
Occupation: State Senator / Businessman
Age: 60

My education and qualifications are: My name is Mark DeSaulnier, and I'm running for State Senate to fight for the communities in the Tri-Valley. My passion for government and public policy is based on a simple principle: I believe that we need leadership that is progress-oriented and focused on the issues that matter most. That's why I've taken on big challenges as a member of the Senate. I've fought to reform California's government, create jobs, safeguard the environment, provide quality health care and protect the public's safety. I strongly believe that California's future depends on full funding of education. As your Senator, I've stood up against shortsighted layoffs and cuts at neighborhood schools. I've also been proud to partner with California Schools Superintendent Tom Torlakson to increase access to critical after-school programs. As Chairman of the Senate Transportation and Housing Committee, I've fought for more public transit, and for safety and efficiency improvements to local streets, bridges and highways. It's my top priority to provide our neighborhoods with the highest standards of constituent service. Along with my staff, I've helped local residents avoid foreclosures and cut through red tape. The Tri-Valley deserves a Senator that will work tirelessly to serve its interests. That's why I'm running for re-election: to fight for our communities, our schools and to enact real reforms for our state government. I promise to be a strong advocate for the neighborhoods of the Tri-Valley, and I'd be proud to earn your vote on November 6th. -Mark DeSaulnier
markdesaulnier.com
Candidate’s Statement
STATE SENATE
Ninth Senatorial District

LONI HANCOCK
Occupation: State Senator

My education and qualifications are: It has been an honor to represent the 9th Senate District for the last four years. In these difficult economic times, I have used my experience in local, state and national government -- as an education official in the Clinton Administration, two terms as the first woman elected Mayor in Berkeley, and three terms in the State Assembly -- to fight for universal health care, strong environmental protections and excellent schools. I seek re-election to continue that work, and to advocate for an improved state government that can build an economy in which all Californians can thrive. I have a strong record of supporting job creation in the Bay Area and have carried legislation bringing billions of dollars in construction funds for the new western-span of the Bay Bridge, new and modernized schools and improved local streets and roads. As an Assemblywoman, I chaired the Natural Resources Committee, co-authoring landmark legislation to combat climate change, protect open space, expand recycling, and encourage healthy city-infill strategies. I am endorsed by the Sierra Club and League of Conservation Voters. As your Senator, I Chair the Senate Public Safety Committee and am spearheading efforts to reduce California’s prison population and free up funds for education, health care, and job creation. As the author of the California Clean Money and Fair Elections Act, I am working to get special interest money out of state elections. There are tough decisions and hard work ahead, and I would be honored to have your vote.
AL PHILLIPS
Occupation: Union Construction Superintendent

My education and qualifications are: My name is Al Phillips and I am running for the 16th Assembly District because I believe our state can return to the days when we had a vibrant economy and a strong will to succeed. Our families need jobs, and as a union carpenter, I’ve seen firsthand how our legislators in Sacramento have passed laws and regulations that have hampered our economic development. Let’s stop the train to nowhere! Our taxpayers are tired of the state using deceptive accounting gimmicks to balance the budget; we have an obligation to provide our children with a state that is first in education without burdening them with a future of debt. As a member of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and chairman of the City of Livermore Energy and Environment Committee, I understand the importance of balancing our environmental needs with realistic regulations that won’t be punitive against responsible businesses. This is a big task and so far our legislators have failed us. When I’m elected I will push for an independent audit of all state departments to find out where we have spending problems and then fix them. We need to prioritize our needs and put education, healthcare and public safety on the top of the list. We need to use our gas taxes to repair our roads not to support pet projects. I would be honored to have your support; please visit www.voteforalphillips.com to learn more. Thanks for your consideration; I am looking forward to serving you and working hard for California.
Candidates’ Statements
MEMBER OF THE STATE ASSEMBLY
Eighteenth Assembly District

ABEL GUILLEN
Occupation: Community College Trustee
My education and qualifications are: I grew up in a working-class neighborhood, the son of a baker and a cook; and first in my family to graduate from college, earning a master’s degree from UC Berkeley. I was lucky enough to have great teachers, good schools and the opportunity to succeed. Everyone deserves the same chance. That’s why I have devoted my life to creating opportunities for children and families, improving our schools, creating good local jobs, and fighting corporate special interests to ensure our community comes first. I’ve worked as a school finance expert for 10 years. I have helped raise over $2.5 billion to build, upgrade and renovate public schools and community colleges across California. I am also serving my second term as a Community College Boardmember, representing Laney, Merritt, Berkeley City College and the College of Alameda. I first ran for public office because I was fed up with state budget cuts and corporate special interests hurting our schools. I helped reform our college district, protected education and job-training programs from cuts, and stopped mismanagement and abuse. When I discovered Wall Street banks were charging huge fees and making risky investments with our colleges’ funds, I stood up to the big banks by moving our money into local, community-based banks that put our dollars back to work here in the East Bay. In the Assembly, I will continue fighting for our community. Please join California Teachers Association, California Nurses Association, Sierra Club, Democrats and working families in supporting our campaign. abelforassembly.com

ROB BONTA
Occupation: Vice Mayor; Deputy City Attorney
My education and qualifications are: I am honored to be the official choice of the California Democratic Party and Assemblyman Sandré Swanson as your next Assemblymember. I was selected because of my experience and record of accomplishments improving the lives of East Bay residents. As Vice Mayor, I helped reform police and firefighter pensions without layoffs or cuts in services. This responsible leadership earned me the support of police officers and firefighters in Oakland, Alameda and San Leandro. I fought for economic development at our former Naval Air Base that will create up to 9,000 local jobs. With teachers and parents, I took on Governor Schwarzenegger to stop education cuts, and helped generate $84 million in local education funding that can’t be taken by the state. I led education reform efforts to expand preschool and after school, and learning and life skills programs for public school students in Oakland, Alameda and San Leandro. The son of a Filipino immigrant, I developed a passion for public service growing up at the United Farm Workers (UFW) headquarters. My parents were organizers alongside César Chávez. Through financial aid and work study programs, I put myself through Yale University. I met my wife 23 years ago at college orientation and today we are proud parents of three school-age children. As a practicing attorney, I partnered successfully with the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) to prevent racial profiling on our highways. In the Assembly, I will make a difference for you and your family. For more, visit www.robbonta.com. Thank you.
Candidate’s Statement
MEMBER OF THE STATE ASSEMBLY
Twentieth Assembly District

BILL QUIRK
Occupation: City Councilmember/Scientist
My education and qualifications are: I am honored to be the only candidate endorsed by the California Democratic Party and a broad coalition of organizations including those representing nurses, firefighters, teachers, police officers, environmentalists and working families. Over 250 elected and community leaders also support my candidacy. They know that my 30 years of volunteer service and 8 years on Hayward City Council will make me an effective leader in the Assembly from my first day on the job. My priorities are: improving schools, creating jobs, and ensuring safe, clean neighborhoods. On City Council, I’ve fought to increase school funding, balance our city budget while keeping police on the streets and fire stations open, and stimulate job creation by promoting small business and reducing and streamlining regulations. In the Assembly, I will fight for resources for public schools, community colleges and universities to educate and train Californians to compete for in-demand 21st century jobs. I will support local fire and police services by stopping state raids on local government funds. As a scientist, I studied climate change at Lawrence Livermore Lab and NASA. I will bring an in-depth, analytical perspective to Sacramento to benefit citizens, not special interests. I was PTA president when my children attended local public school and I remain active in Rotary, Friends of the Library, Sierra Club, and Neighborhood Watch. Join local community leaders, the California Democratic Party, nurses, firefighters, police officers and environmentalists in supporting me for State Assembly. See www.electbillquirk.com or call my cell at (510) 329-7475 for more information.
BOB WIECKOWSKI
Occupation: State Assemblymember
My education and qualifications are: After a successful career as a small business owner and a Fremont City Councilmember, I've had the honor of serving our community in the State Assembly for the past two years. My experience of building coalitions to get results on the local level has proven invaluable as I have fought to change the status quo in Sacramento. I hit the ground running, focusing on job creation, solving our state's fiscal problems, investing in clean technologies, and reducing unnecessary regulations that have caused businesses to leave our great state. In my first term in the Assembly, I launched the “Made in California Jobs Initiative” to expand California manufacturing, invest in biotechnology and other emerging technologies, and provide hiring tax credits for small businesses. As part of this initiative, I am working hard to bring innovative businesses and the jobs they create to our community. Last year, building on my work at the local level, I authored landmark legislation, signed by Governor Brown, to help local governments solve their budget problems. By rising above the partisan bickering and working with both Democrats and Republicans to find new solutions, we can get California working again. With your continued support, I will bring new leadership to create local jobs, cut government waste, fight for affordable higher education, and bring together the private sector and public sector to expand job training opportunities. Please join nurses, firefighters, teachers, police officers, environmentalists, small business owners and working families in returning Bob Wieckowski to the State Assembly. www.BobWieckowski.com.

ARYLYNE DIAMOND
Occupation: Businessowner/Professor
My education and qualifications are: The finest education in the country, coupled with the excitement and creativity of high tech businesses, made California the world’s most desirable place to live. I've lived in Silicon Valley since the 60’s and have seen our quality of life flourish—and now, I can’t just stand by and watch as our fortunes decline. Jobs have left. The quality of K-12 education has deteriorated. We need outstanding leadership to help us—and California—move forward. As a small business owner and management consultant since 1981, I work with private and public organizations to help people work more effectively with each other. As a university professor teaching MBA courses, I show students how to get the best out of themselves and others. As a resident active on many community boards and commissions, I work to make our community a better and freer place for everyone. As your Assemblywoman, I will fight unnecessary regulations and bureaucracy so that jobs return to California. I will advocate for more of our tax money to be spent in the classroom rather than in the already bloated administration, and I will lobby to set and maintain standards for teaching excellence. My broad experience as a businesswoman, Ph.D. and academic will enable me to demonstrate that innovation and limited government will help restore California's prosperity. With your help, we can once again become a land of freedom and opportunity for all. I seek your vote for Assembly, District 25.
KEVIN BRISTOW  
**Occupation:** University Academic Adviser and Program Administrator, Foster Youth Advocate  
**My education and qualifications are:** Growing up in foster care and earning a master's degree, I know first-hand how higher education can transform lives. I’m running for the Ohlone College Board to ensure access to affordable, high-quality education for our community; and to help our most vulnerable students achieve their dreams. I understand the challenges that students face today. For the last 15 years, I have worked as an academic adviser and program administrator at the California State University, and have helped young people from foster care access higher education. This unique perspective and passion will allow me to effectively serve the students, faculty, and staff of Ohlone College. I believe our economic future depends on a strong investment in education. The students of today make up the workforce of tomorrow, which means we have to provide the classes and training that will prepare them for the high-paying jobs of the future. We must also ensure that the Ohlone District is fiscally responsible, and uses its resources wisely, to best serve our students. That will be my top priority. I have the skills and experience needed to serve as an Ohlone College Trustee. Thank you for your vote on November 6th.  
www.BRISTOW4OHLONE.com

BOB BRUNTON  
**Occupation:** Certified Financial Planner  
**My education and qualifications are:** I pledge myself to two major goals: Enhance the quality of education at Ohlone and providing a trustee board that is more responsive, responsible and accountable to our citizens and students. I will promote board polices that set high fiscal standards that are sound and sustainable, that spend within its means, and prepares for the future. I will encourage negotiation of labor contracts, that allow for flexibility and accountability to meet today’s and future students educational needs. I will seek ways to effectively communicate between our students, college and community. As a long time Fremont citizen I am aware of the vital role Ohlone College has in our community. I will use my experience as former trustee, parent of past students, a local business owner, and certified financial planner to ensure that Ohlone will be ready to provide affordable, relevant and quality education and training, to our students and local employers. I ask for your vote – Robert (Bob) Brunton

GREG BONACCORSI  
**Occupation:** Science-Math Teacher/Incumbent  
**My education and qualifications are:** State budget cuts and a faltering economy threaten to weaken Ohlone College. As a Board Member, I have been vigilant in making sure our community college sustains a comprehensive program during these uncertain times. Our economy cannot improve without a strong public education system that includes a strong community college. Community colleges are a vital link in the public education system. They serve as the only college access for many students in our community. And, they offer career training for both graduating high school students and for adults reentering college or seeking new occupations. As a lifelong Fremont teacher and a product of our public schools, I will continue to be a strong voice on the Ohlone Board. My focus will be: (1) Monitor the implementation of building projects to increase our college’s capacity and to be a gateway to higher education and career/vocational training, (2) Maintain high-quality educational programs and services to students while balancing the budget; and (3) Develop partnerships with students, instructors, administration and businesses so that Ohlone can be fiscally responsible and accountable. I look forward to being a part of the future for Ohlone Community College District. I respectfully ask for your vote.

TERESA COX  
**Occupation:** Ohlone Community College District Trustee  
**My education and qualifications are:** Four years ago I was elected to represent you on the Ohlone Community College District Governing Board. I have kept my promises as your trustee. My goal has been simple: operate a world-class community college system that provides access to the education, training and technologies local students need to succeed in 21st century jobs and careers. I have worked hard to help Ohlone excel during the worst State budget crisis in decades. Our Board has balanced budgets, prevented the loss of accreditation, increased student transfer rates to four-year colleges and universities, passed a $349 million dollar bond measure to modernize aging college facilities, and developed programs to train students for green jobs. Receiving a quality education helped me achieve success in work and in life. I was the first African-American woman in the nation to earn a nuclear engineering degree. I successfully transitioned from engineering to a thriving business career. I am currently international strategy executive for a major cloud computing company, and I am a former Chair of the Economic Development Commission for the City of Fremont. There is more work to do – I am eager to continue. I would appreciate your vote. Thank you. www.electteresacox.com

Candidates’ Statements  
**OHLONE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**  
Trustee, Area 2
CANDIDATES' STATEMENTS
PERALTA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Trustee, Area 2

TYRIENE AMEY
Occupation: Small Business Owner of a Management Consulting Firm, high school football coach, Substitute Teacher, a husband and father.
My education and qualifications are: I bring over 15 years of leadership training and experience to the Peralta Community College Board of Trustees. I am passionate about education and I want to work hard to make classes more accessible so that everyone that wants an education can get an education. I am a graduate of the United States Military Academy at West Point, an officer Commissioned by the President of the United States, and a disabled veteran with the educational background, critical thinking and problem solving skills necessary as a trustee. I vow to use my project management training, my engineering degrees, and experience in the private sector to provide needed oversight and knowledgeable insight to decisions on how we spend our tax dollars as we work to make our community colleges more accessible in our increasingly mobile environment. I believe partnerships with the local business community should not only lead to more resources for our students, but also provide valuable work and intern opportunities.

JURENA L. STORM
Occupation: Member, State Board of Governors for California Community Colleges
My education and qualifications are: I have the experience and know-how to hit the ground running on my first day as an elected member of the Peralta Community College District Board of Trustees. During 2010-2011, I served as one of two Student Trustees on the PCCD Board and currently serve as a gubernatorial appointee to the California Community College Board of Governors. My experience as a participant in Community College governance and policy development qualifies me to provide responsive leadership to the board. As a trustee I will: Assume the kind of fiduciary responsibility needed to ensure the District remains within budget. Provide educational policy leadership to make certain that current and future students have instructional substance and student support services needed to achieve success. Work collaboratively with the Chancellor to expand the board’s “short list” to include more qualified firms/companies that are located within the cities that comprise the Peralta District; and promote a recruitment policy that accentuates the importance of attracting qualified instructional and classified personnel who reside in the district and/or graduated from one of the many colleges located within the borders of the District. I would be honored to have your vote. Endorsed by: Peralta Trustees, Guillen, Withrow, Gulassa, Yuen.

RANDY REYNALDO MENJIVAR
Occupation: Small Business Owner
My education and qualifications are: I grew up in the Oakland flats. I benefited from my parents’ encouragement and work ethic. I earned a bachelor’s degree from Saint Mary’s College. I also took classes at Laney and Merritt Colleges, so I am familiar with the Peralta District, both as a student and as a community member. Reduced state funding has led to led to cuts of hundreds of class sections, counseling hours, and other student services in the Peralta District. In June 2012 voters approved the Measure B parcel tax which makes available $8 million in new revenue each year for 8 years. If elected, I will work actively to use Measure B funds to restore full-time and part-time jobs so the District can once again provide quality education for young and older adults. I will also emphasize budget reform and will work with other Peralta Trustees to bring transparency to the Peralta budget. I will provide oversight to assure the responsible use of Measure B funds. I will emphasize efforts to produce stability for the district. I will be accessible to students, employees, and community members, and will “put the community back in our community colleges.”

MEREDITH BROWN
Occupation: Attorney
My education and qualifications are: I’ve lived in Area 2 for over 15 years, have two children and for over 10 years been an active board member on national and local non-profit service organizations targeting youth literacy, youth sports, college scholarships for capable but financially disadvantaged students, and been a youth soccer coach. I am a Cornell University and Boston University School of Law graduate and have worked with public entities, conducted public hearings and maintained legal compliance and transparency in government. I founded a local law practice specializing in Education, Construction, and Labor and Employment; all areas preparing me well for the Peralta Board. I’ve negotiated public agency agreements, prepared legislative reports and resolutions and drafted a public agency Procurement Manual that was adopted by a state fiscal oversight agency as a positive cost saving device to maintain year-to-year fiscal responsibility. Peralta is challenged with serving more students than the state pays for and I’ll provide committed leadership to find creative ways of fully serving them with less. As Trustee my priorities will be quality instruction, student support, local business commitment, employment fairness, workforce equity and making Peralta the premier Community College District, despite diminished funding and other challenges.
TRISH SPENCER
Occupation: Parent, Attorney, Community Volunteer and Children’s Advocate, currently serving as Alameda Unified School District Board Member

My education and qualifications are: B.A., U.C. Berkeley (Sociology); J.D., Western State University, Attorney. California School Board Association's Masters in Governance. Co-chair Alameda Collaborative for Children, Youth and Families, serving 35+ organizations. Former PTA Council President, overseeing all AUSD PTAs, and Substitute Teacher at virtually every AUSD school. My focus is creating an environment where every child has the opportunity to succeed. This requires smaller classes, rich curriculum, diverse electives, and advanced placement, career-technical, and vocational courses. I support fiscally responsible, joint use recreational facilities: sports fields, pools, and parks. I strongly support the education of anti-bullying for all (differently-abled/special needs, ethnicities, gender, LGBTQ, race, religion) to ensure a safe learning environment. Fiscal responsibility is paramount to ensure each dollar is wisely spent benefitting students first. Therefore, I voted against a significant raise for the Superintendent, leasing of new administrative offices, and contracting unneeded consultants. I have the experience to manage during tough economic times and, unlike the other Board members, I support public disclosure of AUSD expenditures. I am a dedicated, compassionate, detail-oriented leader. Together, we can tackle the quality-of-education, equity, and fiscal challenges, while representing diverse interests. I would be honored by your vote.

www.votetrish.com

BARBARA KAHN
Occupation: Retired Social Worker

My education and qualifications are: After nearly 50 years of being active in Alameda PTA and the Children's Defense Fund, I decided to run for Alameda School Board. I have been involved with and watched this district since the 1970's. My daughter taught in Alameda for 20 years. It is disheartening to see the focus change from the needs of children to the wants of adults. I am running because I believe a voice must be raised in support of children. We voted for a parcel tax because we believed that our children and teachers needed us to. I served on the Measure A oversight committee. The board raised the superintendent's salary and refused teachers a raise. The board is moving the district office and has leased a building for a half million dollars annually. There are alternatives, just not as convenient to the adults. We must invest our limited resources in classrooms where they belong. I will work in collaboration with teachers, parents, administrators and other school employees to promote investing in better learning environments and working conditions. I will use my voice to refocus our administration on what is truly important - our children and teaching and learning.. I ask for your vote.

NIELSEN TAM
Occupation: Incumbent

My education and qualifications are: As an Alameda Unified School District teacher and principal (39 years), parent/grandparent, and current School Board member, I have been deeply involved with educational excellence within AUSD for 43 years. My long-term experience and historical perspective within AUSD provide me with the knowledge, training and commitment necessary to lead our district during this critical period. I bring elementary and middle school administrative and teaching experience to complex decision-making. I will continue to respect, value and encourage the involvement and contribution of Alameda's parents, students and community. Giving back to my community, I was a board member of the Alameda Food Bank, Girls, Inc. and Alameda Point Collaborative. I serve on the boards of Alameda Family Services, Alameda Community Fund, and the Alameda Multicultural Center. I am also on the Advisory Board of the Boys and Girls Club, the Commission on Disabilities, and was Co-Chair for the Alameda Youth Collaborative. I received the Alameda Red Cross Award for Community Service and the San Francisco Koshland Civic Unity Award. In my roles of service, I built partnerships with AUSD, the City, businesses and the community. I pledge my continued dedication to you, and ask for your support.

ROBERT W. MANN
Occupation: Parent/Attorney

My education and qualifications are: PhD, Genetics - UC Berkeley

My education and qualifications are: JD - UCLA School of Law. I ask for your vote for AUSD School Board to help keep Alameda schools great. I am an East Bay native, the product of California public schools, and the parent of an AUSD student. My father was an East Bay public school teacher. A quality education for Alameda students depends on attracting and keeping quality teachers. I want the Board’s budgetary decisions to reflect this priority. Beyond merely having open meetings, I want to proactively solicit the opinions of parents and teachers in making Board decisions, and to make the Board more responsive to community needs. While future school funding remains uncertain, I will do the utmost to maintain a quality education for all students, high achieving and special needs, alike. While I would endeavor to improve test scores and graduation rates, I do not want enrichment programs to fall by the wayside. I believe the Board’s job is to foster an educational environment where students thrive, not merely produce adequate test scores. Please join me in making Alameda schools the best part of Alameda.
Candidates’ Statements
ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Governing Board Members

RON MOONEY
Occupation: Parent, Education Advocate, PTA Leader, Businessman, Incumbent
My education and qualifications are: As a parent of two children attending public school in Alameda (elementary and high) and a third in college, I am passionate about public education. Alameda Unified School District must provide the best for our children, support our dedicated teachers and staff and create graduates ready for college or careers. Despite our budget constraints, we must push our schools even more to provide better choices to parents, reach for higher standards, and improve our sites. As President, I worked with my colleagues to create a Master Plan that does just that, and to ensure Measure A and all monies are spent wisely and appropriately. I have a proven track record and experience supporting education. I earned the National Lifetime Achievement Award during over 12 years with PTAs, and I have worked with non-profits such as AEF. Furthermore, my AUSD and business experience give me a unique perspective on providing leadership, as well as redesigning our schools to be accountable, effective and efficient in the years and decades ahead. For dedicated, passionate and experienced community leadership I ask you to vote for me, Ron Mooney. www.ronmooney.net

JON MURPHY
Occupation: Instructor, Ed.D., Alameda Resident
My education and qualifications are: Please vote for me on November 6, 2012. I am excited about students achieving their highest potential in a district where parents, teachers and staff can work collaboratively for this end. My vision for Alameda School District is to improve: a) team building, b) staff development, c) technology awareness and resources, and d) accountability/transparency of administration at all levels. These are the foci of the 21st century in education of our youth in the public school system. I come to you as a nonpartisan leader with the objective to promote pedagogy in our schools which embraces lifelong learning for our future. I will facilitate decisive action for improvements, particularly where needed in these four areas. My knowledge and experience as a Senator on the Academic Senate Committee, as a Program Director in a CA State School, and as a Co-Chair of their Budget Committee has prepared me for this next step, to serve as your school board representative.

MICHAEL ROBLES-WONG
Occupation: Retired Business Manager
Age: 62
My education and qualifications are: I have lived in Alameda for 25 years. Our oldest daughter is a Hornet alum and her sister is a Jet via Nea Charter. I have taken community leadership roles in the recent past including: Civil Service Chairperson; President of the Community of Harbor Bay Isle; Campaign Chair of Measure A; and as the dad of the lead plaintiff in the lawsuit against the state for failing to properly fund public schools. During a 33-year career spanning several local public agencies, my responsibilities included financial and budget administration, executive recruitment, and labor relations. If elected, I will work hard, focus on pro-active change, and exercise leadership to foster consensus between teachers, administrators, parents, students, and the community at large. The Superintendent’s contract and rapidly aging neighborhood schools will be significant tasks the new Board will confront. If you believe as I do that a healthy amount of skepticism and proven leadership skills at the community level is needed, please vote for me. Thank you.

TOM LYNCH
Occupation: Parent, Businessman
My education and qualifications are: Alameda deserves to be benchmarked against the best Bay Area School Districts – Palo Alto, Cupertino, Piedmont – and that’s why I’m running for School Board. My priorities will be focused on 1) quality of education, 2) equity of education for all students across our City, 3) active support for our teachers, 4) District fiscal responsibility, and 5) encouragement of parent participation in their child’s education. I intend to address the major challenges the District will face over the next four years which include: rebuilding our schools, some close to 100 yrs old, lowering our operational costs, increasing our revenue and bringing our teachers pay up to the average teachers’ pay across Alameda County. I’ll help advocate for securing reliable school funding from the State, adoption of Governor Brown’s weighted student funding, District readiness for the State’s new SMARTER Balanced Assessment Testing Consortium, and children’s health and safety. My 30 years of management, sales, and system engineering in the high tech industry, combined with extensive knowledge of State and Local funding, State FPPC compliance, plus my extensive volunteer work in Alameda uniquely qualifies me to help make a difference for Alameda Schools.
KURT PETERSON
Occupation: Businessman
Age: 58

My education and qualifications are: If you are tired of seeing School District administrators getting hefty raises and expensive new facilities for their offices while students and teachers do without basic necessities, then I am your candidate for Alameda Unified School District Board Member. I have been a successful local businessman for over 35 years and know how to get the most out of a tight budget. I also serve on the Alameda Point Restoration Advisory Board and the Alameda Open Government Commission. My two sons attended Alameda schools for their K-12 educations before going on to graduate with degrees from UCLA and San Francisco State. It saddens me to see all the policy changes that have taken place in the school district since they attended. I believe in fair and open negotiations of all school district contracts. There is nothing more important to our society than to prepare our youth for a challenging future with a strong education. As residents of this great city, you have a right to know where your hard earned tax dollars are going. With all the recent reductions in State Funding for schools, our youth need every bang for every buck. To accomplish this, I kindly ask for your support and vote.
CVSC-1

Candidates’ Statements
CASTRO VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Governing Board Members

KUNIO OKUI
Occupation: Accountant
My education and qualifications are: CSUN (Northridge), BS in Business Administration, Masters of Governance and Masters of Boardmanship from the California School Boards Association. My background as an accountant/financial planner has enabled me to assist the school district in maintaining a strong financial position. Through prudent financial management the District has been able to maintain an exemplary academic program with minimal cuts. During my tenure, the community has passed three bond elections which funded the high school stadium and science building, the Center for the Arts, Creekside Middle School gym, elementary science centers, seismic and security upgrades. I believe in the future of our children and their pursuit of academic excellence. The schools’ scores in standardized tests are among the highest in the county. Over 80% or our schools have been selected as California Distinguished Schools. I have been a Castro Valley resident since 1975. Our three children are Castro Valley High School graduates. Two of my grandchildren attend Castro Valley Elementary School. I will continue to be most diligent and responsive to the needs and concerns of our community. To ensure the continued high quality of education for our children, please vote for an experienced and financially astute incumbent.

JOHN J BARBIERI
Occupation: Castro Valley Unified School District Governing Board Member
My education and qualifications are: I am asking for your support, endorsement and, most importantly, your vote on November 6. With my many years of business experience and a number of years as a Board Member and Personnel Commissioner involved in shared decision-making, qualify me to provide responsive leadership. The board is publicly transparent regarding academic achievement and financial stability. The district is recognized throughout California school districts for its excellent fiscal management based on its vision for educational excellence and a sense of responsibility. As your board member, I will continue to work hard and in collaboration with parents, teachers and staff to insure that student achievement remains our highest priority. I will continue to listen and encourage good ideas to improve education for our children. I will not take you for granted. The ongoing state budgets cuts to schools terrify me. We need our state to support better funding for education. I am committed to being publically transparent regarding district finances. I hold a life time teaching credential and have taught math, economics and management at Chabot College, and have completed Masters in Governance that addresses leadership skills, finance, facilities, human resources and board management. Vote for John J. Barbieri

JO A.S. LOSS
Occupation: Castro Valley Unified School District Governing Board Member
Age: 56
My education and qualifications are: Castro Valley’s children and community deserve the best possible public schools. During this state financial crisis, our schools need knowledgeable and committed leadership to continue to maximize resources and opportunities for our students and staff. I am proud that we have maintained the highest levels of academic achievement with quality facilities and have demonstrated prudent fiscal management. Castro Valley’s schools continue to thrive with a focus on each student’s individual academic performance. To enhance my contributions, I have earned a Masters of Boardmanship and a Masters of Governance from the California School Boards Association. I have served the California State PTA as President, President-Elect, Vice-President of Leadership and Vice-President of Education. The State Superintendent of Schools appointed me to California’s P-16 Council (preschool to college). I have served as President, Vice-President and Secretary/Treasurer for the Alameda County School Boards Association. I have a proven track record as a champion for public education in Castro Valley and statewide. Your vote for Jo Loss on November 6th will be vote for strong and vital public education in our community.

CHARMAINE BANTHER
Occupation: Math Teacher
My education and qualifications are: As a public school teacher for 25 years, I have witnessed how the power of a good education can lift children to their fullest potential. Unfortunately, student success stories will be few and far between if we stop investing in public education. Castro Valley students deserve the highest quality education, and if elected to the board of education, I will be a strong advocate for smaller class sizes to promote better learning. I will also support building on core academic programs like math, science and technology to better prepare our students for the challenges of the 21st Century. Whether entering college or the ever-changing job market, every student deserves a high quality education. If elected, I will strive to look outside the box for funds and solutions to improve working conditions and learning environments for our teachers and students. I will work together with teachers, parents, principals, administrators and other school employees, to form strong collaborative partnerships to address challenges facing our district. Castro Valley deserves the best, and I am committed to ensure we continue to be a great place to live and raise a family. I respectfully ask for your vote.
MARY PIPPITT
Occupation: Educator
My education and qualifications are: As an educator with over 30 year’s experience, I will bring to the CVUSD School Board a broad educational perspective including classroom teaching, administration, leadership development, and school reform. I understand the needs of teachers, students and schools. It's time an experienced educator sits on the board; someone with deep knowledge and understanding of teaching and instruction gained from working inside schools. My experience with students, schools, and districts to improve student learning, build teams and provide positive leadership will guide my thinking and influence decisions toward the interests of students and teachers. My priorities include retention of superior teachers and staff, preserving critical educational programs through strategic planning and budgeting and establishing and maintaining trust, transparency and common goals. In these financially challenging times, we need to perform cohesively as board members, district personnel, teachers and community members ensuring that resources deliver the greatest educational benefit for all students. Elevating communication to a level that is respectful, inclusive, and responsive to community will help meet these goals. I chose to run for the CVUSD School Board because I possess the passion, time, experience and energy to ensure that school resources deliver the greatest educational benefit for all students.
## Candidates’ Statements

**DUBLIN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**Governing Board Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>My education and qualifications are</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAN CUNNINGHAM</strong></td>
<td>Trustee, Dublin Unified School District</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>During these difficult economic times, it’s important that our schools experience sound leadership to guide them through the continued financial challenges ahead. As a Trustee for the Dublin Unified School District, I’ve helped guide the district through these tough times. Due to strong leadership and fiscal management, our district hasn’t been forced to lay off any teachers and test scores at all schools continue to rise. In addition, I’ve helped to ensure the Measure C funds have been utilized as promised to the voters of Dublin. I bring over 20 years of experience as a financial executive. My educational experience includes a strong background in finance and accounting with a BA in Economics from UC Santa Barbara and an MBA from CSU Long Beach. I have three sons, one currently enrolled in the district and the other two alumni of Dublin High School. In addition, my wife is an English teacher at Dublin High School. As a financial executive and a Trustee, I am committed to continuing the work of the past four years to ensure that the Dublin Unified School District stays focused on all students achieving to their fullest potential. Support the future of our schools and students: on November 6th, vote for Dan Cunningham.</td>
<td>Trustee, Dublin Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GREG TOMLINSON</strong></td>
<td>School Board Trustee, Dublin Unified School District</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Dublin Unified School District excels with strong, experienced leadership and as trustee and president of the Dublin Unified School District Board, I, along with my fellow trustees, have delivered results. We’re upgrading all campuses, embracing new technology, and providing teachers with vital tools so students excel, all while maintaining fiscal solvency. Students must be supported, inspired, and challenged. We’ve implemented initiatives for academically-challenged students, enhanced graduation standards, and rising test scores prove our leadership works. We’re enhancing focus on real knowledge relevant to students’ lives, and not merely “teaching to the test”. I’ll have children enrolled in Dublin Unified School District my entire term. I promise continued collaboration, communication, and transparency with parents, teachers, and students to create a positive, adaptable learning atmosphere that recognizes the unique needs of each student. As a former Dublin Planning Commissioner and construction specialist, I’ll utilize my project management experience to ensure our bond funds are invested wisely, without delay, to benefit all students and all campuses. I graduated cum laude from USC in Business Administration. Former Mayor Janet Lockhart endorses me, and when I’m reelected your trustee, I’ll work to make you proud of Dublin Unified School District.</td>
<td>School Board Trustee, Dublin Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUSTIN OGDEN</strong></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>I offer a unique perspective as the only candidate to be educated in the Dublin Unified School District, enabling me to recognize the relevant needs we have in our schools. I was an active member of leadership groups and athletics throughout my eight years as a Dublin student, serving as DHS Rally Commissioner during my senior year. I wish to continue my service to our schools as a member of the Dublin Unified School District Board of Trustees. I have gained over twenty endorsements from DHS teachers, class officers, and valedictorians by declaring my ambition and platform as a candidate. These include supporting the recognition of multiple learning styles for tailoring of curriculum to fit student needs, making ROP (Regional Occupational Program) classes a top priority, focusing on authentic student learning, and improving critical thinking and student creativity district-wide. I believe that the school board should be diverse in order to be most effective, and my experience in our district would build such diversity. I have the drive and energy to be involved with all K-12 Dublin schools, so I ask you to vote Austin Ogden to be your representative on the Dublin Unified School District Board of Trustees.</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AMY MILLER</strong></td>
<td>School Board Trustee, Dublin Unified School District</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>As a mother of two students and trustee of Dublin Unified School District currently serving as vice-president, I’ve worked inside and outside the walls of the boardroom to put the needs of our students first. With valuable input from our stakeholders and collaborative efforts of our leadership team, I am proud that the Dublin Unified School District has remained fiscally solvent, enhanced educational support programs, raised test scores, modernized facilities, and upgraded technology. Our approach to educating students is moving in a new direction in order to provide a 21st century education. College and career readiness is a top priority; we are committed to our students’ success long after they graduate. I serve on the DPIE and Tri-Valley Regional Occupational Program boards and was instrumental in identifying outside funding to save the ROP nursing program. With a Master’s of Science in Educational Psychology and Counseling and a PPS Credential, I will continue to utilize my educational and work experiences to ensure every child across this district reaches their fullest potential. I will tirelessly advocate for equity and equal educational opportunities for all. I would be honored to have your vote so that I may continue to represent you and serve the students of the Dublin Unified School District.</td>
<td>School Board Trustee, Dublin Unified School District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

www.AmyMillerforDublin.com
Candidates’ Statements
FREMONT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Governing Board Members

DESRIE CAMPBELL
Occupation: Executive Administrator
My education and qualifications are: There is much to be done, and I am eager to share my passion and experience to address the needs of our children. I would be honored to have your vote on November 6, 2012. I have been serving the City of Fremont as a civic leader for 10 years. Currently, I serve as President of the Fremont Education Foundation, a member of the School Districts’ Citizen’s Oversight Bond Committee, a Human Relations Commissioner for the City of Fremont, and have a BS degree in Business Administration. As a small business owner, I have the professional and community leadership needed to continue taking an active role in helping our schools face today’s challenges. I am dedicated and passionate about education and our children’s future, and I know how to get things done. I am committed to partnering with the school district, parents and teachers so that all of our children receive the highest quality of education, in a safe and clean environment. I believe in the power of business and educational communities working collaboratively to ensure that all students achieve at their highest potential. Please vote for Desrie Campbell - FUSD School Board. Together we can make a difference!

ANN CROSbie
Occupation: Substitute Teacher Fremont
My education and qualifications are: I am running for the Board of Education because I have the experience in education and advocacy in Fremont Unified to make a difference for Fremont students. My core mission will be to ensure that we are meeting the educational needs of all students and graduating students prepared for the 21st century global workforce. Since moving to Fremont, I have donated my time at the nine Fremont schools my children have attended and served on several district committees. I’m currently a substitute teacher in Fremont. While working on my Master’s Degree in Educational Best Practices, I’ve studied ways to meet the needs of all students - including high achievers, students with special needs, English language learners and students who are disengaged with learning. As Legislation Chair for Fremont Council PTA, I have advocated for Fremont in Sacramento and recently was flown to Washington, DC, by National PTA to represent California in education advocacy training. It is crucial to build strong partnerships between administrators, staff, teachers and parents. As an Ohlone College Trustee, I work collaboratively, while making tough decisions. Help me ensure that our students have a rich educational experience and are prepared for the 21st century. Vote Crosbie for kids.

YANG SHAO
Occupation: Life Scientist
Age: 44
My education and qualifications are: As a scientist and a proud father of two students in FUSD, I understand the importance of a quality education. Like many, I came to the U.S. to seek the American dream, worked hard to obtain my Ph.D from Harvard and began a career in the biotech industry developing diagnostic tools for cancer research. I want to make sure that ALL of our students are given the same opportunity to pursue their dreams. As a School Board member, I will fight to strengthen our schools by building Student Achievement, Budget and Community Support. Student Achievement is a big challenge because of the disparity among various groups of students. I will make sure that equity is served and ALL students are given the opportunity to achieve their full potential. Budget crises have persisted and worsened since 2007. California schools are suffering from a fiscal cancer. With my cancer research training and analytical skills, I will strive to work with everyone to improve the fiscal health of our schools. Community Support is essential to the success of our schools. The diversity in Fremont makes our school district unique and strong. I will endeavor to collaborate with our community to support our schools.

RESHMA KARIPINENI
Occupation: Finance Director, Parent, Businessperson
My education and qualifications are: As a parent of two and a Fremont resident for over 30 years, I am concerned about the effect of the weak economy on our public schools. Budget pressures have created overcrowded classrooms, unsafe facilities, and employee dissatisfaction. This has taken away opportunities for students and made it harder for teachers to teach. Professionally, I am dedicated to building financially sustainable businesses that create jobs and educational opportunities. I have the skills to get the most return when dollars are tight, and the experience to involve diverse stakeholders in the decision-making process to reach solutions with lasting impact. As a Board member, I will focus on spending our budget wisely, lobbying for more state funds, raising money by using our existing resources creatively, and ensuring that each child is given the opportunity to reach their potential. My parents were immigrants who believe in education. With their support and a lot of hard work, I was blessed to receive a top-notch education, including an MBA from Stanford. I have served Fremont as a tutor, job counselor, shelter and hospital volunteer. I humbly request your vote on November 6th to help me take my service to the next level. Thank you.
Candidates’ Statements
FREMONT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
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LILY MEI
Occupation: Incumbent
Age: 42
My education and qualifications are: I am honored to serve as the current Fremont Unified School District Board President in these challenging times when it needs active leadership. My passion for the success of our schools and my dedication to our students drive me to serve our community. To ensure effective board governance, I insisted on fiscal transparency, maintained our district’s reputation for award-winning schools in every attendance area, and supported educational programs for all students so they’ll be prepared for the 21st century workforce. With Fremont’s City Council, I advocated responsible housing development and showed the impact housing growth has on the demands for school facilities. My active leadership on local initiatives brought community support for local funds to maintain and restore educational offerings. As a fellow parent, I championed programs focused on student achievement. As regional delegate representative for Alameda County, I helped set policy to reflect the interests of our school district. As your trustee on the School Board, I will strive to maintain FUSD’s excellent standards, listen to the concerns of residents, and establish open communication between the School Board and the city government so that decisions are made with our children as a priority. I appreciate your vote. Visit www.LilyMei.org.

HIU NG
Occupation: Retired Technology Executive
My education and qualifications are: Our school district does not need more politics or politicians. I am one of the most active and involved parents in Fremont with deep knowledge and experience of our school district. I have worked hard to improve our schools by serving as Fremont Council PTA’s Legislation Chair, and Health and Safety Committee Chair at two Fremont schools. My most cherished award is the Honorary Service Award from California State PTA. I also served as Chair and/or Member of School Site Councils at elementary, junior high and high school levels. I spent nine months helping to form the Technology Advisory Committee for Fremont Unified School District. As a founding member there, I saved the school district more than a million dollars by successfully opposed a poor proposal with help from other committee members. Here, I am asking for your support and your vote on November 6, 2012 to elect Hiu Ng as a non-political School Board member. More than ever, children must come first. They can’t afford more unnecessary, inappropriate or presumptive budget cuts from the school district. Our children should receive a well-rounded education preparing them for the future. Thank you very much for your help.
Candidates’ Statements
HAYWARD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Governing Board Members

DR. ANNETTE WALKER
Occupation: Educator/Parent
My education and qualifications are: We owe it to the children of our community to provide safe schools with qualified teachers and the resources to learn. Success happens in the classroom. Good things are happening in our district, but we must do better. I am an educator with 20 years of service in public schools from kindergarten to college. As a bilingual elementary school teacher, community college counselor and instructor, and now college admissions specialist at CSU Hayward, I will be an advocate for the rights of all students to get a quality education. A Hayward resident for nearly two decades and parent of a child who attended HUSD schools, I know the relationship between teacher, student, and parent is essential. As your Boardmember, I will ensure that we have essential programs for student success including preschool, smaller class sizes, and student support. I am running because I am committed to the goals of student achievement, college and career readiness, partnership with parents and the community, and modern facilities that are equipped with the resources students need to succeed in the 21st century. It would be an honor to serve you on the School Board. Together, we can make student success our mission. www.annettewalkerforhayward.com.

JOHN TAYLOR
Occupation: Teacher
Age: 53
My education and qualifications are: Hayward’s children deserve the very best education. I am a strong supporter of public schools and it’s teachers. I’ll insist that we constantly provide top quality instruction, discipline and support to succeed in school, and prepare for college and high demand jobs and careers. My accomplishments as a Teacher of the Year (2009, Alameda County), California Department of Education Model Practice Program Teacher (2007 – 2012), State R.O.P. Outstanding Teacher of The Year (2012) and National Award Winning Forensic Science and Criminal Justice Teacher will bring a vast amount of success to the HUSD board. I truly place a strong value on education and I will joyfully bring my experience as an educator to the development and sustenance of US - community members, board members, teachers, district administrators, staff and the students – in our community, who represent the gift of multiple cultures. Together we will make H.U.S.D. better! As a taxpaying business owner in the public safety industry, I will focus on the safety of our children and on creating and sustaining realistic budgets for the district’s success. I am intensely dedicated to bringing educational leadership to the H.U.S.D. Governing Board. I also have the ability to make tough decisions while being objective, fair and inclusive in the process.

HEATHER REYES
Occupation: Legal Administration/Parent
My education and qualifications are: My husband and I are parents of 6th grade and 1st grade Hayward students and are stakeholders in the future of the children. I proudly served in the U.S. Navy, have been a small business owner and currently reconcile financial documents at a law firm. I’m always identifying ways to streamline for efficiency. The success of our students affects all of us whether or not we have children attending Hayward schools. I’ll collaborate with the local business community to cultivate opportunities for future employment of Hayward students. We must duplicate what is excelling in the district, be open to hear from the community, be trustworthy and most of all place a high priority of keeping our children safe. I’ll work with fellow board members, teachers, administrators, parents and students to increase the number of students graduating from high school proficient in all areas. I am running for school board to support the children, challenge them, mentor them, guide them and ensure they have a voice. Your vote will allow me to be fearless in tackling challenging issues and promoting high achievement and discipline with consistency. Call me! 510-677-4557 or visit my Facebook page “Heather Reyes for HUSD Trustee 2012”.

DR. LUIS REYNOSO
Occupation: Hayward School Board Trustee
My education and qualifications are: I have worked tirelessly to improve fiscal and academic accountability in our schools so that every student may pursue higher education. Hayward has been my home for 40 years. My life and teaching experiences have shown me that this school district, larger than the city of Hayward, presents distinctive challenges in its cultural and academic diversity. Past professional experiences for multi-national corporations enable me to evaluate the bottom line which is rare in education budgeting. I have presented useful approaches on cost cutting to put more taxpayer dollars into classroom teaching and less into sweetheart contracts. Prior to serving in office, I was a classroom teacher, holding a BS in Computer Science, a Multi-Subject Teaching Credential, and MS in Educational Leadership and recently earned my Education Doctorate in Organizational Leadership. On the Board of the Regional Occupational Program, I promote academic and career opportunities providing vocational alternate pathways to college. Born in Mexico, I became a citizen as a teenager. Bilingual in Spanish and English, I want to afford all students mastery of the English language leading to successful careers. My job as trustee for HUSD is not complete and more remains to be done. Please give me your vote.
Candidates’ Statements
HAYWARD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Governing Board Members

SARA LAMNIN
Occupation: Planning Commissioner
Age: 41
My education and qualifications are: Hayward deserves positive change in our schools. It is time to bring back achievement and accountability. I have the skills and abilities to make that happen. By putting students first; providing systems to support staff and teachers; requiring district-wide accountability for results; and building on our community's strengths, we can raise test scores and create a safe, engaging environment where expectations are high and students can learn. A hard worker, I lead by example, listen carefully, ensure transparency, and act with integrity. For nearly 20 years, I have led efforts in Hayward, including serving on the Planning Commission, bringing funding opportunities to Hayward Adult School, and developing programs such as Tools 4 School and Kinship Services. My endorsements from City Councilmembers, Business Professionals, Labor Unions, School Personnel, and Community Leaders reflect my ability to collaborate with diverse groups to achieve shared goals. The success and welfare of our students will drive all of my decisions. My vision for HUSD includes a system that prepares students for career and college; increases the individual attention teachers can give our kids; implements assessments and learning plans for all students and decisive, productive School Board meetings. For more information, please visit www.saralamnin.com.

PETER BUFETE
Occupation: Instructor/Business Owner/Volunteer
My education and qualifications are: As a lifelong Hayward resident, I am running for the HUSD School Board for a single but powerful reason: to ensure our students receive a quality education. I am a proud product of HUSD schools, having attended Treeview Elementary, Bret Hart Middle School, and Hayward High School. My Hayward education allowed me to attend and graduate from the University of California, Santa Barbara. I think it’s important to have an individual serving on the school board who has firsthand knowledge about our schools. If elected, every decision I make will always be based on careful analysis of the issue, keeping in mind what is best for the student. Today, I continue my support of schools as a member of the Hayward Education Foundation Board of Directors and the Hayward Coalition for Healthy Youth. Recently, the Hayward City Council also appointed me to the Library Commission. I hope you will join me fight to improve our district’s academic performance, create a safer learning environment on our campuses, and creatively collaborate to keep the district fiscally solvent. I am endorsed by the Hayward School Board President and would be honored to have your vote on November 6.
DAVID JONAS
Occupation: Importer/Distributor

My education and qualifications are: The most important function a community performs is the education of its children. As a School Board Trustee, I believe I can make a significant contribution to carrying out this critical mission. I am passionate about education – my first career after college was teaching school – and that passion will drive me to advocate energetically and effectively for Livermore’s public schools. I possess a well-rounded skill set that positions me to add value to the District in multiple areas, as I have extensive experience in technology, business, consulting, and marketing. I am a skilled problem solver, excellent communicator, and strong consensus builder. As a business owner, I especially understand the importance of customer care; as a Trustee I will focus on understanding what makes our customers – our students and parents – unhappy, and work diligently towards improving our public education product. Livermore enjoys a long tradition of public school excellence. However, our state’s budget crisis seriously threatens this tradition. Guiding our District through these challenging times will require creative, intelligent, open-minded leadership, and I am confident that I will bring these qualities to the Board. I respectfully request your vote, and look forward to serving you.
Candidates’ Statements
NEW HAVEN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
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NICK FRESQUEZ
My education and qualifications are: “No Child Left Behind”; our education system, purpose was to be so bad that parents would demand a change, from under performing public schools to high performing charter schools. NCLB is a “legit” way to transfer public school money to private interests, like Bush’s brother; friends. As Governor, Bush started NCLB. After 5 years, the children in NCLB were less intelligent compare to children not in NCLB, and the school district was more in debt. So you see, NCLB was never an honest, good-faith attempt to educate our children. NCLB is to transfer public school money to private interests. Taxpayers, students should sue everyone involved in implementation of NCLB, Bush, Obama, congress, superintendents, union leaders, school boards, media, etc. for taking public money under false pretends. Fraud, submitting false information, making false claims. Minority, low-income children were made to look stupid under NCLB, should also sue for slander, defamation of character, discrimination - school closures. The New Educational System; Teach the teachers how to teach, test the children on how they learn. We have the money for education, social security, jobs, etc. But its going to the Bankers for the problems “they” created. Let’s get our money back!

MICHAEL RITCHIE
Occupation: Appointed Incumbent
My education and qualifications are: Providing a well-rounded education to all children in a safe, healthful and challenging learning environment is my top priority. I have been a dedicated volunteer for the past decade, serving on the CCMS and JLHS site councils and the New Haven Boosters Association and Schools Foundation. As a community leader, I have been instrumental in continuing co-curricular programs that are critical to the comprehensive education of our children. Most recently, I was appointed to fill the open school board seat by a unanimous decision of the school board. I have had valuable ‘on-the-job’ training this past year, preparing me well for a full term. As a long-time business marketing professional, I bring a unique perspective which I will continue to leverage to address district issues: working to improve graduation rates, resolving district funding shortages and closing the achievement gap. As a parent of three district students (including one graduate), I have a deep appreciation for our teachers and staff. To succeed, students need talented and dedicated teachers benefitting from strong professional development, sufficient state funding, an insightful and efficient administration, and expanded community support. I ask for your vote to continue to work to achieve this vision.
PENNY PECK
Occupation: Retired Children's Librarian
Age: 57
My education and qualifications are: As a lifelong resident of San Lorenzo and former manager of the Washington Manor Branch Library, I have attended or visited many schools in the district. I attended Lorenzo Manor, Bohannon Junior High, and San Lorenzo High School. I earned a B.A. in History at Cal State Hayward, and a Master's of Library Science at San Jose State University where I still teach part-time. As the children's librarian for San Leandro Public Library, I often visited schools, many in the Manor area, and worked with parents and teachers to motivate children to read and help them with homework. I believe our schools need to spend money at the classroom level, decreasing class sizes, as well as updating our school buildings with green technology to transform the entire schoolyard into a learning environment. Our schools serve children of many different cultures and we need to see that as something to celebrate. I offer a common-sense approach to problem solving and working with administrators, teachers, parents, and other board members.
MARY HAYASHI
Occupation: California State Assemblywoman
Age: 45
My education and qualifications are: I have dedicated my life to public service, believing that everyone deserves fairness and the opportunity to live a healthy and secure life. Health insurers used to be able to cancel a policy after someone got sick. I passed the law to stop that practice. Violence against women and children is underreported because victims live in fear of their abusers. That's why I established funding for the Alameda County District Attorney's Family Justice Center to prevent and prosecute domestic violence. Too many people take their own lives because they didn't know where to get help, so I created the statewide Office of Suicide Prevention. Education is the key to opportunity and I passed legislation that increased public education funding by $500 million through the State Lottery. This work earned me honors from the American Red Cross, California Medical Association, and Planned Parenthood, and a 100% voting record with Sierra Club, Equality California, and California League of Conservation Voters. Before serving as an Assemblywoman, I was a member of the California Board of Registered Nursing, Chabot Community College Foundation and Girls Inc. of Alameda County. I will continue this important work as your supervisor. I would be honored to earn your vote.

MARK GREEN
Occupation: Mayor of Union City
Age: 59
My education and qualifications are: It is time to restore competence as a qualification for elected office in Alameda County. For over 20 years, I have consistently delivered on pledges to improve Union City, Alameda County and the Bay Area. Tough minded and creative approaches to problems in transportation, housing, public safety, commercial development, recreation and the environment have exemplified my tenure. I have not voted to harm cities and counties and refuse to be a puppet on a string dancing to the tune of special interests. We have enough people in office willing to cave, collapse and capitulate to pressure. As a voter in District 2, you have a chance to elect a candidate with an independent mind and not one held hostage by partisan politics. I welcome support across the political spectrum and invite independents, Republicans, Democrats and others to vote for me on November 6. We need to start the process of economic growth, increased public safety, infrastructure improvements and building healthier communities in Alameda County. As a 41 year resident in the district, a University of California, Berkeley graduate and concerned citizen who will be addressing problems from a fresh perspective, I respectfully ask for your vote on November 6. www.ElectMarkGreen.com

RICHARD VALLE
Occupation: Alameda County Supervisor, District 2
My education and qualifications are: I was unanimously appointed by the Alameda County Board of Supervisors to serve your needs following my predecessor’s resignation, an honor I accepted to restore Accountability, Service and Integrity to this office. I have no interest in using this appointment as a stepping stone to another elected position. As a life-long resident of Alameda County and former Vice Mayor of Union City, nothing is more important to me than listening to your concerns, being accessible and serving your needs as your County Supervisor. It's time South County residents get the attention we need and deserve! I’m the founder of California’s largest nonprofit recycling organization, creating hundreds of jobs for local youth and the South County workforce. As a War Veteran, I understand the unique challenges that many of us face in difficult times. I have a proven track record of strong fiscal management, job creation, supporting our youth, economy, and healthcare needs. I’m continuing the fight to save St. Rose Hospital and make our communities safer! Join Senator Ellen Corbett, County Superintendent Sheila Jordan, Supervisors Nate Miley and Wilma Chan, former County Sheriff Charles Plummer, and local police officers and firefighters in supporting me, and visit www.ElectSupervisorValle.com. If I can assist you, please call 471-4714.

Candidates’ Statements
ALAMEDA COUNTY
Supervisor, 2nd District –Short-Term
Jeff Cambra

**Occupation:** Attorney/Community Mediator

**My education and qualifications are:** My Living in Alameda the last 25 years, I have seen our island flourish. I have always taken an active role in making Alameda a better place to live, work, and play, whether it was serving as President of the League of Women Voters, assisting the City’s Sunshine Task Force, co-producing the Asian Pacific Islander Cultural Festival, or chairing our City’s Bike to Work Day. A leader in our city’s business organizations, I work to revitalize our business districts and sustain the locally owned businesses that serve our families. As a former assistant city attorney drafting laws and advising a city council, I have learned how government works. We must preserve Alameda’s unique quality of life by continuing to provide valued community services to all from youth to seniors. As your Councilmember, I will work to ensure the safety and security of our residents, promote economic development, continue the partnership with our schools, and exercise fiscal accountability. You can count on me to be accessible, effective, and committed to the future of our great city. It would be an honor to serve you on the City Council and I respectfully ask for your vote. www.JeffCambra.com

Jane Sullwold

**Occupation:** Alameda Golf Commissioner, Lawyer

**Age:** 57

**My education and qualifications are:** As chair of the Alameda Golf Commission, my goals were to preserve our heritage and to secure our future. I led the opposition to the plan to dismember the Golf Complex and turn the par-three course over to a developer. I also championed the effort to select an ecologically and economically sound long-term operator. Preserving our heritage and securing our future also will be my goals as a Councilmember. The problems facing Alameda are difficult – but not insoluble. Renewal of Alameda Point must be jump-started. The City budget must be brought under control. Blaming previous Councils for stalled development and swollen budgets doesn’t cut it. Nor does bemoaning the obstacles we must overcome. Let’s get all the options on the table – and out in the open. I will be an independent voice of reason, beholden neither to City staff nor to special interests. I will ferret out the facts before I offer an opinion. And I will rely on persuasion rather than intimidation to get results. I was born in Fargo, North Dakota, and graduated from Brown University and Harvard Law School. I moved to this great community in 1998, and want it to thrive and prosper. Website: www.jane4council.com.

Stewart Chen

**Occupation:** City of Alameda Healthcare District Director; Doctor of Chiropractic

**My education and qualifications are:** My primary goal in running for City Council is to preserve and improve the quality of life in Alameda. This is our home and it has been good to us. My wife and I raised both of our children here. They attended Alameda public schools and grew up with the benefit of our parks, libraries, and hospital. I believe such facilities are important, and I pledge to work to keep them accessible to all Alamedans. I believe that everyone has a right to these freedoms and amenities. We achieve this as a community by electing city officials who care about people’s needs and work towards them. Twelve years ago, I decided to devote some of my time to public service - not to do something grand, but to help wherever I could. I served two terms on the Social Service and Human Relations Board, one term on the County’s Human Relations Commission, and in November 2010, I was elected to the City of Alameda Health Care District Board. Now, I want to use my experience and energy to represent and serve our community as a councilmember. Vote for me, Dr. Stewart Chen, on November 6 and let me be your voice. Stewartchen.org

Tony Daysog

**Occupation:** Urban planner

**Age:** 46

**My education and qualifications are:** “Think positive: plan ahead.” That’s the motto of my campaign. I am running for City Council to bring City Hall and our community together, to put us on the same page. If we stay positive, plan ahead, and work together, we can accomplish so much, including implementing the best City Hall pension-reform plans. When I was on City Council (1996-2006), I took pride in listening to and working closely with residents on a range of issues, having led successful projects including the development of Bayport at Alameda Point and the creation of the “traffic safety toolkit” to make crossing streets safer for school-children and the elderly. What will aid me in working closely with residents is the fact that I am an urban planner by profession, with a Master’s degree in city planning from UC Berkeley. I also earned my Bachelor’s from Berkeley. And, I love Alameda. I grew up in and continue to reside in the West End: the Farmers’ Market is literally in front of my home, so, if elected, you can shop for farm-fresh produce and chat with your Councilman. Daysog4Council2012.com or 510-864-7593. Thank you.
Candidates' Statements
CITY OF ALAMEDA
Councilmembers

GERARD VALBUENA DUMUK
Occupation: Cal Fire Firefighter
My education and qualifications are: Out of the box solutions for an oval island. At 5 years old, Gerard’s parents abandoned careers, fled a dictatorship, and immigrated to America and raised 3 children. At 18, Gerard became a US citizen, his main motivation being the right to vote. Since then, he’s dedicated years of his life to public service including time as a paramedic, and 9 seasons as a CDF Firefighter. They answer the call over 300,000 times each year. Alameda is no different with it’s eminent fiscal emergency and hot political environment. As a charitable Elk, he is often in the company of elders. He enjoys their life stories, anecdotes and meaningful discussion of local issues. Gerard believes in a slow growth policy for the island of Alameda. “We’re an island. We can’t magically make more land”. “New growth if any, should be senior housing. We owe our grandparents affordable housing. They’ve fought in wars, raised children, and imparted on us morals and values. Our seniors enrich us. They car-pool, take the bus, commit no crime, and participate in the community as volunteers” With senior housing also comes a tremendous underlying economy of care providers and health-care workers, creating new jobs for Alamedans.

MARILYN EZZY ASHCRAFT
Occupation: Planning Board Member/Arbitrator/Attorney
My education and qualifications are: 16 years of community leadership in Alameda has prepared me well to serve as your Councilmember. I’ve been a Planning Board Member, Economic Development Commissioner, and Hospital Board Director. I’ve volunteered in schools, and co-chaired successful campaigns to build the new Main Library and keep Alameda Hospital open. In 6 years as a Planning Board Member and President, I’ve helped stimulate economic growth and bring high quality, sustainable development to Alameda. Recently, I worked with VF Outdoor to bring 470 new jobs here. I’ve also helped revitalize Webster and Park Streets. On the Hospital Board, I worked to support patients, improve healthcare services and achieve a balanced budget. In my work as an arbitrator, I help opposing individuals and businesses resolve disputes. This experience will help me bring people together and achieve results for you at City Hall. I’ve spent most of my life in Alameda. My husband and I raised our children here. I care deeply about Alameda’s future. As your Councilmember, I’ll work to create jobs and housing opportunities, achieve a sustainable budget, protect our environment, promote ethical city government, and ensure Alameda remains a vibrant, livable community. marilyn4alameda.org
ABCC-1

Candidates' Statements
CITY OF ALBANY
Councilmembers

PETER MAASS
Occupation: General Contractor
My education and qualifications are: I have lived in Albany for 13 years. My daughter will attend Albany Middle School this fall. I am an East Bay native and graduated from UC Berkeley with a BA in Political Science, and received a Teaching Credential from SFSU. I have been a member of the Planning and Zoning commission for the last six years. This unique position has given me a greater appreciation for and understanding of our diverse urban community which strives to maintain its “small town feel”. If elected I will continue to support our community strengths: strong support for education, progressive and green values, healthy, active families, and the outstanding safety record of our emergency services. I will promote responsible development that enhances our walk able urban environment, work to implement our green house gas and active transportation goals, keep the city financially solvent and protect our Shoreline. I have been an active member of Citizens for the Albany Shoreline and am endorsed by the Sierra Club. I have also been coaching my daughters Soccer team for the last couple of years and strongly support causes that protect children’s health here and abroad. For more information go to petemaass.com

MICHAEAN BARNES
Occupation: UC Science Editor
My education and qualifications are: In 1995 I moved to grad student housing in University Village. Five years later I bought a house near Albany High, where my son graduated in 2010. Solar panels keep our utility bills low, and I do much of my commuting and shopping by bicycle or on foot. I have spent most my career working in the public sector, first as an economic analyst for the state of Washington, and later as a research analyst for the University of California. For the last six years I have been a science editor and writer at UC Berkeley. I served on the Albany school board from 2002 – 2006. I learned that local governments can be very effective when skilled staff members, elected officials and the public respect each other and work together creatively. If elected to the city council, I would provide expertise on the complex issues facing our city, from creating better cell phone policies to coping with climate change. I would bring an independent, tough-minded yet fair approach to the city’s problems. I am a supporter of Albany’s Climate Action Plan, and I would like to work with my fellow citizens to fully implement the plan.

SHERI SPELLWOMAN
Occupation: Homemaker/Fitness Instructor
My education and qualifications are: I am running for City Council because I want Albany to become a truly progressive leader among cities. I believe as a community, we have the power, and the responsibility to create a healthy, sustainable environment that promotes the highest possible quality of life, for all of our residents. I am a member of the Green Party, and have been a political activist for many years, working for women’s rights, gay rights, peace and justice, and the environment. I am a yoga teacher and mother of two, dedicated to natural and holistic living. My daughters were both born at home, one right here in Albany. I am concerned about the ecological and economic crises our society is facing, and I want to help create a better world for future generations. My husband and I moved to Albany for the tremendous sense of community we feel here. I would like the opportunity to serve this community, as a member of City Council.

NICK PILCH
Occupation: Software Development Manager
Age: 51
My education and qualifications are: I believe that working with people is key to building a sustainable city, both environmentally and economically. As an active citizen, I have worked closely with the City and developers to make sure projects advance our City’s environmental sustainability, such as by providing good biking and walking access, while also providing economic benefits. I live in Albany with my wife and son, and like all of us enjoy the benefits of the Albany schools, both directly and indirectly. As the School District appointee, I serve on Albany’s Parks and Recreation Commission (three years as Chair), where I have worked for years improving and protecting Albany’s parks and fields for all users. I have also served on the Traffic and Safety Commission and co-founded Albany Strollers & Rollers, an organization dedicated to improving safety and mobility for our children, seniors, and everyone who walks or bicycles in Albany. Finally, I serve as a Sierra Club Leader and I have their endorsement. Albany needs an independent voice that listens to all sides. I believe I can be a bridge that brings people together for the good of Albany. I would be honored to serve as your City Council member. Please visit nickpilch4albany.com.
TOD ABBOTT
Occupation: Albany Business Owner
Age: 48
My education and qualifications are: I believe Albany is best served by a City Council that provides balanced judgment and decisive leadership. I believe my education, professional background, and involvement in the community uniquely qualify me to serve on the Council. I earned degrees in Philosophy (BA CAL, MA Northwestern) studying logic, ethics, and American Pragmatism. I have owned a web design and development company for 15 years. While volunteering on the board of the Albany Chamber of Commerce for six years, I worked with community organizations and city staff on local projects while supporting our community and local small businesses. I have two children in Albany Middle School, and have volunteered at Cornell School, Albany Preschool, Cub/Boy Scouts, and ABGSL. I am strongly concerned about the environment, and have worked for the US EPA, and created a lifestyle that minimizes my family's impact. It is crucial that a City Council Member maintain an open mind and be receptive to the voices of the community, but also be decisive and clear-thinking. My training in Philosophy helps me understand all sides of a discussion, while my business experience helps me understand when it is time to act. Please vote for me. Visit AbbottForCouncil.org.

ULAN MCKNIGHT
Occupation: Business Owner
My education and qualifications are: My roots are in Albany. I grew up and am raising my family here. I started my business here because my vision for our town is simple: small business development built upon a foundation of community involvement. I have been a business owner for 25 years and have employed hundreds of people, from students to seniors, over the years. I understand the challenges small businesses face. I can help align business and community interests with City Council. I love the diversity of our city and seek to expand participation within the political process. While we will not agree on everything, we can work together to build consensus that will bind our community. Our small town can thrive by coming together during these tough economic times. We must invest in our future by supporting activities for children and working families. I want to see thriving Solano and San Pablo business districts. I will work to promote and expand community events such as Movie Night, Albany Streets and Dinner With Albany. Albany is better when we pool the financial resources and human talent within our community.

PEGGY THOMSEN
Occupation: Incumbent
My education and qualifications are: I appreciate having had the opportunity to serve as your council member during the past 3 ½ years and am seeking your support for reelection. I have a proven record as an effective and responsible representative of Albany's citizens. Throughout my 28 combined years on the city council and school board, I have demonstrated my commitment to open, responsive government by listening carefully to all who wished to speak before making decisions. During my terms as Mayor and School Board President, every person wishing to speak had that opportunity. During my current council term, I have appointed people not previously involved in city government to committees. I am committed to maintaining Albany's small-town character while meeting the needs of all our people, senior to youth. I will work to assure that our excellent basic services, including police and fire, are maintained, that infrastructure needs are met, and that we foster both economic and environmental sustainability. I am proud to have worked with my neighbors on the city's only new open space, the Pierce Street Park. Working together, we can continue to make Albany a special place to live. I ask for your vote. Education: Ph.D., Educational Administration, UCB; https://sites.google.com/site/peggythomsen/
Candidates’ Statements
CITY OF ALBANY
Board of Education

PATRICIA LOW
Occupation: Incumbent
Age: 51
My education and qualifications are: I wish to continue to serve as a member of the Board of Education in order to maintain stability in Albany schools while supporting continued excellence and improvement during these challenging times for California public education. My experience as a board member, teacher, Albany parent, PTA and community volunteer, and educational researcher, as well as my doctorate in education, have provided me with broad exposure to public education, educational curriculum, research and policies. I also have a deep understanding of and respect for the diverse community our schools serve. During my first term as a board member, I oversaw financial stability in the district in the face of ongoing state budget cuts. I helped to establish transparent governance standards that enable the board to work more effectively as a team. In addition, I participated in a clarification of the district’s mission and strategic goals that includes a focus on the education and well being of the whole child. I am a graduate of U.C. Berkeley, San Francisco State and Stanford University. Most importantly, I am passionate about supporting our public schools to prepare all young people for productive and joyful futures. To learn more about me, please see www.smartvoter.org/vote/pat_low

RON ROSENBAUM
Occupation: Incumbent, Educator
My education and qualifications are: I have been an Albany resident for 38 years and have been a public educator since 1971. My experience with the education system is extensive, having been a middle school teacher, a counselor, head counselor, vice principal, and a Principal. The last Principal position I held before retirement was at Albany High School, where I collaborated with teachers, parents, and students to improve the quality of education and promote change. I have been keenly interested in the quality of Albany schools since my daughters attended them from the Children’s Center through high school. I am seeking reelection so that I may continue to work on important educational goals such as developing a strong, broad curriculum to engage all students, ensuring equity of education for all students, supporting and empowering all members of the educational community: students, parents/guardians, teachers, staff, and administrators, providing a forum for open and collaborative decision making, and ensuring the fiscal health of the Albany Unified School District. I urge you to vote for me so I can continue to work with our educational community to create a school district that is second to none, with all students—pre-kindergarten to adult—achieving and thriving.
Candidate for MAYOR

I, BERNT WAHL, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Berkeley, and make the following statement:

1. That my name is Bernt Wahl
2. The office for which I am a candidate is Berkeley City Mayor
3. That my residence is 1911 Martin Luther King Jr. Way, Berkeley, CA 94704
4. The place of my birth is Santa Monica, CA
5. My present occupation is U.C. Berkeley Engineering Adjunct Professor, Factle CEO a Berkeley GIS mapping company, and Advisory Board Member
6. I have held the following public offices: None
7. Record of community service: U.N. Ecotourism Committee, Fulbright Fellow - State Department, National Park Service, American Red Cross, Habitat for Humanity, BMUG, U.C. Berkeley CITRIS, Skydeck DiR, LHS Advisor
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.

9. For over 20-years, I remain drawn to the Berkeley's unique character, charm and diverse population. A citizenry comprised of merchants, laborers, activists, naturalists, service workers, builders, designers, engineers, students, academics and other concerned citizens. I have start technology firms and author books here; besides my community involvement and teaching engineering at U.C. Berkeley. I have been involved on the national and international level (United Nations, National Park Service, US State Department Fulbright, California Energy, We Care Solar, Neighborhood Mapping, etc. For Berkeley I see economic development, governmental transparency, and analytic decision making as key issues. I currently serve as an Executive in Residence for the Skydeck, a joint venture between the City of Berkeley, UC Berkeley and LBNL to promote the transfer of technology research to create real world products in Berkeley. I will explore how technology can be used to: reduce crime (e.g. track stolen bicycles), pinpoint needed services (e.g. GPS identify potholes), build out a viable energy plans (e.g. promote systems that are cost effective) and provide increased data access (e.g. free Wi-Fi for the downtown area). As Berkeley Mayor I plan to lead our city to meeting the many challenges before us in shaping Berkeley’s future.

10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley: None

s/BERNT WAHL
1. That my name is Kriss Worthington.
2. The office for which I am a candidate is Berkeley Mayor.
3. That my residence is 2808 Hillegass Ave. #1, Berkeley, Ca. 94705
4. The place of my birth is Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
5. My present occupation is Berkeley City Councilmember.
6. I have held the following public offices: Berkeley City Council; Vice Mayor; Rules Committee; Telegraph Committee; Downtown Committee; Eco-Pass Committee; Berkeley Housing Authority; Berkeley Redevelopment Agency; Berkeley Civic Improvement Corporation; Alameda County Congestion Management Agency; CMA Plans and Programs Committee; CMA Administration and Legislation Committee; Berkeley, Oakland and San Leandro Major Investment Study Policy Steering Committee; San Pablo Policy Steering Committee; Alameda County Transportation Authority (ACTA) alternate for Keith Carson; ACTA Administration, Legislation, Finance Committee; Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority (ACTIA) alternate for Keith Carson; ACTIA Administration, Legislation, Finance Committee; Alameda County Waste Management Authority; League of California Cities delegate; VLFL Expenditure Plan Steering Committee; B3 Countywide Transportation Plan Steering Committee, Vice Chair; Alameda County Transportation Commission, alternate; Association of Bay Area Governments, alternate; Oakland Airport Noise Forum.
7. Record of community service: Sierra Club Northern Alameda Group Chair; Bay Chapter Excomm; NOW; NAACP; Telegraph Area Association (Chair, Public-Safety Committee); Berkeley Safe Neighborhood Committee; LeConte Neighborhood Association.
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.
9. It’s time for a new Mayor who will support our excellent employees, great management, and the public by fixing legendarily dysfunctional meetings. City Council meetings shouldn’t be a marathon. Let’s schedule lengthy hearings on a separate night, in a room big enough to accommodate the crowd. It’s time for a Mayor who will address fiscal responsibility, reinstate a rainy day fund, and stop a $225,000 severance package for the CEO if fired for poor performance. It’s time for a Mayor who will appoint Asians, Latinos, African Americans, Native Americans and Students to commissions in fair numbers. It’s time not to trust “trickle down” development. Our neighborhoods are not a Monopoly board. Corporate developers must address affordable housing, labor, environment, and parking concerns. It’s time for refreshing independence from the status quo. I’m known for supporting “progressive” issues relating to Labor, the Environment, Diversity, Seniors, the Disabled, Women, the LGBT community, Consumers, and Tenants.
I also helped to create Berkeley Pride, Berkeley Holocaust Remembrance Day and revive Berkeley Cinco de Mayo. Equally important are my achievements in constituent services, Public Safety, Fiscal Responsibility, Jobs, Small Business, Economic Development and Veterans. See 100 of my accomplishments at www.krissworthington.com 510-548-8796
10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley:
Max Anderson, Berkeley City Council District 3
Jesse Arreguin, Berkeley City Councillor, District 4
John T. Selawsky, President, Berkeley School Board
Lisa Stephens, Chair, Berkeley Rent Stabilization Board; Former Chair, Parks and Recreation Commission
Judy Shelton, Rent Board Commissioner; 2012 Affordable Housing Convention-Endorsed Candidate
Asa Dodsworth, Berkeley Rent Board Commissioner, & Community Organizer
Alejandro Soto-Vigil, Housing Advisory Commission Vice-Chair & Rent Board Candidate
Jacki Fox Ruby, Former Pres., Berkeley Federation of Teachers; Former Pres., California Federation of Teacher; Former Pres., Alameda County Board of Education; Former Legislative Director, Calif. alliance Retired Americans boona cheema, B.O.S.S. Building Opportunities for Self Sufficiency, Executive Director; 42 years, working in a multi-cultural community; former Health and welfare commissioner and women’s commissioner
David C. Gan, Retired Public Health Microbiologist and individual member of Disabled American Veterans and American Legion - Berkeley
Robert E. Smith, Friend; Adult Aging Agency; former Personnel Board for two Mayors; former California Senior Legislature Senator; former PAPCO Board; former Alameda County Commissioner on Aging
Kahlil Jacobs-Fantauzzi, teacher, community activist, Block Captain, South Berkeley
Denisha DeLane, District 2 City Council Candidate
Jane Falk, Ph.D; long term North Berkeley resident
Karl J. Reeh, President LeConte Neighborhood Assn.; former Disaster Council Chair
Danfeng Koon, Graduate Student in Education Policy, UC Berkeley; Managing Editor, Berkeley Review of Education; Former ZAB (Zoning Adjustments Board) member
Fabienne Vaughn Williams, Senior Citizen, Artist, Textiles, Jewelry, Painting
Iris Crider, Senior, Harriet Tubman Terrace resident
Margy Wilkinson, Retired, U.C. Union Activist
Donald A. Jelinek, Former Berkeley Councilmember

s/KRISS WORTHINGTON
1. That my name is Jacquelyn McCormick
2. The office for which I am a candidate is Mayor
3. That my residence is 305 The Uplands, Berkeley, CA 94705
4. The place of my birth is Los Angeles, CA
5. My present occupation is Small Business Owner
6. I have held the following public offices: None
7. Record of community service: Berkeley Council Watch; Berkeley Budget SOS; Claremont Elmwood Neighborhood Association; Children's Hospital of Oakland; Family Support Services of the Bay Area; United Way; Aviva Center
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.

9. Berkeley should be at its best; so why isn’t it better? Our downtown and shopping districts are struggling. Streets, parks and pools are in decline. We have a billion dollars in unfunded needs and no plan to pay for them. The city had years to address these and other challenges but hasn’t done enough. That is why I am running for mayor. As a founding member of Berkeley Council Watch, Berkeley Budget SOS and a Board Member of my neighborhood association, I understand the challenges facing our city. In my 30 years of professional experience, I have successfully managed expansive budgets and am prepared to restore Berkeley’s financial health. I have attended every council meeting over the past two years and have witnessed the will of the people being ignored. I am running with the promise to put the people who live and work here first, to return our city to its people and neighborhoods. Berkeley needs independent leaders who are free to make decisions; leaders who will put our neighborhoods before developers. I have the energy to move us forward and the vision to get us there. With your vote we can, and will, build a better Berkeley.

www.mccormick4mayor.com

10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley:
Mark Humbert, President, Claremont-Elmwood Neighborhood Assn
Karl Reeh, President, LeConte Neighborhood Association
Theodore Edlin, President - Council of Neighborhood Assn. (CNA)
Joan Barnett, President, Dwight-Hillside Neighborhood Association
Isabel Gaston, President, Northeast Berkeley Association (NEBA)
Cathleen Quandt, Fifth and Channing Neighborhood Association
David Bowman, Member of Potter Creek Neighborhood Association
Dean Metzger, Coordinator Berkeley Neighborhoods Association
Patrick Sheahan, Planning Commissioner, City of Berkeley
Gene Poschman, Planning Commissioner, Past Chair Zoning Adjustment Board, Past Chair Budget Review Committee, Past Vice Chair Planning Commission, Past Member Downtown Area Plan Advisory Committee
Patti Dacey, Planning Commissioner; Former Commissioner, Landmarks Preservation and Public works Commissions; Downtown Area Plan Advisory Committee Member (DAPAC)
Anne Paxton Wagley, Landmarks Preservation Commission; Animal Care Commission; former Chair Housing Advisory Commission
Barbara Gilbert, Vice-President, Northeast Berkeley Association; Director, Berkeley Budget SOS; Member, Campaign for FACTS
Patrick Finley, Environmental Attorney
L. Tim Wallace, Emeritus Extension Economist – UC Berkeley
Kahlil Jacobs-Fantauzzi, South Berkeley Block Captain, Teacher, Community Organizer
Shirley Dean, Former Mayor, City of Berkeley
Jesse Arreguin, Councilmember - District 4

s/JACQUELYN MCCORMICK
Candidate for MAYOR

I, ZACHARY RUNNINGWOLF, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Berkeley, and make the following statement:

1. That my name is Zachary RunningWolf
2. The office for which I am a candidate is Mayor, City of Berkeley
3. That my residence is 2701 Forest Ave, Berkeley
4. The place of my birth is San Francisco, CA
5. My present occupation is Native American Elder
6. I have held the following public offices: Peace & Justice Commissioner
7. Record of community service: As an Indigenous leader since 1996 I have worked with the Intertribal Friendship house, American Indian Charter School and supported Ethnic studies at UCB
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.

9. During this critical time of global warming and economic crisis we need a strong proven leader and not a career politician. I draw my inspiration from the wisdom of my Native American ancestors whose teaching demand that we take responsibility for our actions. I will stand with the entire community in supporting reasonable growth, environmental protections for all, and will promote the use of bicycle transportation including a citywide bicycle-lending program. It is time we make government responsive to all and not just a privileged few. My multi-cultural background gives me a unique understanding about our diverse community and their needs. I am opposed to the current efforts to criminalize our homeless population. All citizens have the right to sit and to be seen. Nobody is illegal. We need to fight for community services and protections for our senior residents. We are all one people. As mayor, I will protect all neighborhoods including those in west Berkeley. I will move to revitalize the Telegraph area, and support the conversion of several blocks near UC into an auto free outdoor commons. More trees, less concrete, more bikes, less cars, more town, less gown, more open government

10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley:
   - Mark McDonald
   - Nick Bertoni
   - L A Wood, former City Environmental Commissioner
   - Daniel McMullan, Founder of Disabled People Outside Project
   - Jeffrey S. Melcher

s/ZACHARY RUNNINGWOLF
Candidate for MAYOR

I, KAHLIL JACOBS-FANTAUZZI, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Berkeley, and make the following statement:

1. That my name is Kahlil Jacobs-Fantauzzi
2. The office for which I am a candidate is Mayor
3. That my residence is 1307 Derby St. Berkeley, CA
4. The place of my birth is Santa Barbara, CA
5. My present occupation is Teacher, Community Organizer, Small Business Owner
6. I have held the following public offices: Youth Commissioner, Youth Outreach Sub Comitte, Peace and Justice Commissioner, Political Prisoner and Indiginouse People Sub Committee
7. Record of community service: KPFA Local Advisory Board, After School Volunteer, Neighborhood Block Captain, La Pena Cultural Center, Founder Bay Area Boricuas, Students for Hop Hop Founder, Berkeley Copwatch
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.

9. A New Vision, A new face. A new Solution. I decided to run for Mayor because Berkeley needs a new generation of leadership with a vision of change and progress. I strongly believe that our city needs an innovative and genuine leader that is in touch with all citizens. Previous mayors have catered only to specific communities. This has resulted in a city divided, with stark inequities in housing, education, safety, and opportunities. My mission as mayor will be to bring the city together as a community and to increase economic prosperity, to improve living conditions for all residents, to support ecologically sustainable improvements, and to reclaim the ideals of our city. I am committed to eliminating the equity gaps in housing, academic achievement, health, safety and technology. The focus of healthy environments and green practices needs to be inclusive, rather than just in certain neighborhoods. Affordable housing and transportation continue to be a problem for many Berkeley residents. We need to look for ways to support both owners and renters in making safe housing affordable and to improve transportation to all parts of our city. It’s time for change. We have hope. Please vote Kahlil for Mayor www.kahlil4mayor.org

10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley:
   Kriss Worthington, Berkeley City Council
   Jesse Arreguin, Berkeley City Councilmember
   Melba Maldonado, Executive Director La Raza Community Resource Center
   Bonnie Cediel, Former President Alameda County School Boards Assn.; Retired Teacher Advocate, Block Captain Berkeley Hills
   Jacquelyn McCormick, Berkeley Council Watch, Berkeley Budget SOS, Claremont Elmwood Neighborhood Association (CENA) Board Member
   Andrea Prichett, Berkeley Copwatch Co-founder; teacher Willard
   Asa Dodsworth, Rent Board Commissioner, Community Organizer
   Stewart Jones, Green Party Berkeley Teacher, Medical Cannabis Commissioner, Waterfront Commissioner
   Juana Alicia Araiza, Artist, Berkeley City College, Chicana Latina Foundation
   Joy Moore, Teacher - BUSD, KPFA Producer, Ecology Center
   Max J. Blanchet, Board Member, LAMBI Fund of Haiti - For Identification Only
   Morgan E. Cosey, Berkeley Residence, St Paul A.M.E. Church, U.S. Postal Service
   Nesbit Crutchfield, African-American Activist
   Paola Laverde, Interpreter
   Gibran Francis Beckwith, Photographer, Student,
   Tim Jones, Union Carpenter
   Heather Watkins, Artist/Instructor
   Tori B. Amos, Berkeley Parent, Small Business Owner
   Robert H. Harbin, South Berkeley Resident, former Block Captain
   Denisha DeLane, Former NAACP National Board Member

s/KAHLIL JACOBS-FANTAUZZI
Candidate for MAYOR

I, TOM BATES, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Berkeley, and make the following statement:

1. That my name is Tom Bates
2. The office for which I am a candidate is Mayor
3. That my residence is 2225 Ward Street, Berkeley, CA 94705
4. The place of my birth is San Diego, California
5. My present occupation is Mayor of Berkeley
6. I have held the following public offices: Supervisor Alameda County (1972-1976); Member, California State Legislature (1976-1996); Mayor, City of Berkeley (2006-present); Director, Bay Conservation and Development Commission, (2003-present); Member, Bay Area Air Quality Management District (2006-present); Commissioner, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, (2006-present); Chair, Joint Policy Committee (2010-present), Chair, East Bay Green Corridor (2007-present); Member, Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority Governing Board (2004-2006); President, Alameda County Conference of Mayors (2005-2006)
7. Record of community service: Co-founded East Bay Green Corridor, East Bay Shoreline Park, Regional Sports Complex, Berkeley City College, Ed Roberts Campus, David Brower Center, YMCA Teen Center, CIL
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.
9. As your Mayor, I’m proud of what we have accomplished together. Even in these challenging times, Berkeley has balanced ten straight budgets, maintained the highest bond rating for any city our size, and maintained and expanded programs for homeless people and for youth. Our Climate Action Plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions was recognized by the UN as “the best plan in North America”. Our “2020 Vision” education partnership with the school district and community groups to end the achievement gap and health disparities is making great progress. We have built over 300 low income and 1200 affordable housing units, and improved conditions in our business districts and in the Downtown. The City’s major crime rate is at a 20 year low. To develop additional employment opportunities in Berkeley, I’m working to facilitate start-up incubators and increase flexible zoning to allow the small businesses that begin in Berkeley to expand in Berkeley. I’m running for re-election because I’m excited about our progress and our potential. I’m endorsed by Congresswoman Barbara Lee, the Sierra Club, seven City Council members and four members of the School Board. I would be honored to have your support and your vote. For more information; www.tombates.org
10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley:
Sylvia McLaughlin, Co-Founder Save the Bay
Robert B. Reich, Chancellor’s Professor, U. Cal. Berkeley
Weldon Rucker, Former City Manager
Nicky González-Yuen, Trustee, Peralta Colleges Bd
Alice Waters, Restauranteur
Andy Katz, Director, East Bay Municipal Utility District
Jan Garrett, Disability Rights Activist
Josh Kornbluth, Monologist
Karen Hemphill, Berkeley School Board Director
Shahryar Abbasi, ASUC External Affairs Vice President
Ying Lee, Retired Congressional Aide
Barry Fike, Former President Berkeley Federation of Teachers, (Current BUSD Teacher)
Malcolm Burnstein, Elected Member, KPFA Local Station Board
Wise E. Allan, Former Chancellor Berkeley City College
Susan Medak, Managing Director, Berkeley Repertory Theatre
Beatriz Leyva-Cutler, Berkeley School Board Director
Susan Duhan Felix, artist
Ces Rosales, Northern CA Vice Chair, CA Democratic Party Women’s Caucus
Nancy Skinner, Assemblymember
Loni Hancock, State Senator, District 9

s/TOM BATES
Candidate for MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL, DISTRICT 2

I, **ADOLFO CABRAL**, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Berkeley, and make the following statement:

1. That my name is Adolfo Cabral
2. The office for which I am a candidate is City Council District 2
3. That my residence is 834 Channing Way
4. The place of my birth is Panama City, Panama
5. My present occupation is Retired
6. I have held the following public offices: Former District 2 Commissioner, West Berkeley Redevelopment Project Area Commission.
7. Record of community service: Rosa Parks Neighborhood Association, Council of Neighborhood Associations, Citizens Saving Berkeley Main Post Office, Save West Berkeley Plan Committee, Berkeley Neighborhoods Alliance, West Berkeley PAC.
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.

9. Our district is a diverse and vibrant mix of residents, small businesses and artisans at risk of irreversible rezoning threatening our quality of life and our unique businesses and industries. Our neighborhoods face challenges: crime, unaffordable housing, unemployment, rundown parks, potholes, flooding, pollution, earthquake risk, and school achievement gaps. We need leaders from the community who will listen and include us in governing our community. I have worked to reduce crime through neighborhood action in my Rosa Parks neighborhood. My community service included appointment to the West Berkeley (Redevelopment) PAC where I pushed for traffic improvements and also questioned the rezoning project of West Berkeley. I have joined and support my community’s compromises for solutions protecting residents, businesses and industrial lands. I am an independent voice fighting to ensure that we get the benefits that we deserve and put the needs of District 2 first with your ideas. Berkeley is at a crossroads and I ask for your vote to help me bring new leadership to unite us and not divide us, and put people first to move our city forward.

To learn more visit my website: www.adolfocabral4citycouncil.com.

10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley:
    Jesse Arreguin, City Councilmember, District 4
    Jacquelyn McCormick, Berkeley Budget SOS coordinator, CENA board
    Gene Poschman, Planning Commissioner, Past Chair Zoning Adjustment Board, Past Chair Budget Review Committee, Past Vice Chair Planning Commission, Past Member Downtown Area Plan Advisory Committee
    Patti Dacey, Planning Commissioner; Former Commissioner, Landmark Preservation and Public Works Commissions
    Patrick Sheahan, City of Berkeley Planning Commissioner
    Cathleen Quandt, West Berkeley Resident and business owner
    Dave Blake, vice-chair, Berkeley Rent Stabilization Bd; former chair Berkeley Zoning Bd.
    Katherine Harr, Rent Stabilization Board Commissioner
    Alejandro Soto-Vigil, Legislative Aide Berkeley City Council
    Susan Henderson, Executive Director, Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund; For identification purposes only
    Shirley Dean, Former Mayor, City of Berkeley
    Dean Metzger, Former President of CENA
    Zelda Bronstein, Former Chair, Berkeley Planning Commission
    Gray Brechin, Geographer, U.C. Berkeley; member of Save the Berkeley Main Post Office Committee
    Jeffrey Kaplan, Chair, Friends of the West Berkeley Plan and Environmental activist
    David M. Bowman, artisan/Metalworker
    Chris Witt, Neighborhood Watch Member—1100 Parker St. Group
    Michael Colombo, Business Owner of Miccolo Inc (General Contractor) and coordinator of Rosa Parks Neighborhood Association
    M. Sarah Klise, illustrator
    Mary B. White, artist/educator

s/ADOLFO CABRAL
1. That my name is Denisha DeLane
2. The office for which I am a candidate is City Council, District 2
3. That my residence is 2417 6th Street, #10
4. The place of my birth is Oakland, CA
5. My present occupation is Program Associate
6. I have held the following public offices: City of Berkeley Telecommunications Task-force
7. Record of community service: Board Member, BIH Advisory Board, Member, Young Adult Project Advisory Board; Member, NAACP National Board of Directors; Youth Advisor, Berkeley; Former Board Member, Berkeley/Albany YMCA.
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.
9. I'm running to serve the City I love and grew up in Southwest Berkeley is a diverse and vibrant community of residents, small businesses and artisans. Yet it faces many challenges such as health disparities, violent crime, an achievement gap in our schools and rising housing costs. We need a strong advocate who has the courage to stand up and be accountable only to the people of District 2. As a former City Commissioner and aide to Councilmember Margaret Breland, I worked to advance progressive public policy and to make sure our community gets the resources it deserves. I will provide progressive and responsive leadership. I oppose the drastic rezoning of West Berkeley on the November ballot. If elected I will fight for a plan that involves all stakeholders and provides the jobs, housing and other community benefits we deserve, while protecting our residents and small businesses. We have an opportunity to change the direction of our city and elect leaders who will put the needs of citizens first and who will help create a better Berkeley. Please join me in bringing new, dynamic and progressive leadership to the City Council. Working together we can move Southwest Berkeley forward. www.electdenisha.com
10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley:
   Max Anderson, City Council, District 3
   Jesse Arreguin, Berkeley City Council member
   Scott Blake, BOCA Board Member – Berk Resident
   Sam Frankel, retired BUSD Teacher
   Katherine Harr, Rent Stabilization Board Commissioner
   Frances Ann Haselsteiner, Retired
   Sally Hindman, Executive Director, Youth Spirit Artworks
   Kahlil Jacobs-Fantauzzi, Educator, Derby St. Block Captain, Youth Organizer
   Carole Kennerly, Former Vice Mayor, Berkeley City Council
   Lafayette McFadden, Retired, Naval Air Station; Resident
   Toni Mester, Educator
   Cathleen Quandt, West Berkeley resident and business owner
   Karl Reeh, President LeConte Neighborhood Assn.
   Patrick Sheahan, Planning Commissioner, City of Berkeley
   Patricia E. Wall, Attorney, Homeless Action Center
   Kriss Worthington, Berkeley City Council
   Asa Dodsworth, Rent Board Commissioner
   Barry Reed, Jr., Musician & Resident
   Napoleon Samad, Student
   Alejandro Soto-Vigil, Housing Advisory Commission/Legislative Aide Berkeley City Council

s/DENISHA DELANE
Candidate for MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL, DISTRICT 2

I, DARRYL MOORE, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Berkeley, and make the following statement:

1. That my name is Darryl Moore
2. The office for which I am a candidate is City Council, District 2
3. That my residence is 1411 Channing Way
4. The place of my birth is Lynwood, CA
5. My present occupation is Councilmember and Senior Management Analyst
6. I have held the following public offices: Berkeley City Council; Vice Mayor; City of Berkeley Library Director, Chair; Mental Health Commissioner; Trustee, Peralta Community College Board; Chair, Peralta’s Finance and Audit Committee; Committee Member, Peralta’s Committee on Policy Development; Committee Member, Peralta’s Committee on Technology; City of Berkeley Public Works Commissioner; City of Berkeley Housing Advisory Commissioner; City of Berkeley Zoning Adjustment Board Commissioner.
7. Record of community service: West Berkeley Foundation; Berkeley/Albany YMCA; K to College; Alameda County’s AIDS Project of the East Bay; Co-chair, Berkeley Youth Alternatives; Chair, National Black Justice Coalition
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.
9. Serving you on the Berkeley City Council has been an honor and a privilege. We’ve held hundreds of community meetings, large and small, throughout the district to be more accessible to you, and I ask for your vote to continue our partnership on issues facing both our District and the city. Reducing crime has been my top priority and I’m proud that crime rates are dropping. I’m also proud to have doubled the number of youth jobs funded through the city’s summer employment program, led the rebuilding of the South and West Branch libraries as Chair of the Library Board, won federal stimulus funds to repave Sacramento Street, promoted new affordable housing including much needed units for seniors, secured a neighborhood-serving grocery store for West Berkeley, and put together $2 million in funding to rejuvenate San Pablo Park. With your continued support, I will push to restore Aquatic Park, green the Santa Fe right-of-way, and win significant community benefits from new West Berkeley projects for transportation improvements and job training for our youth. Please join Pastor Kelly Woods, Senator Hancock, Assemblymember Skinner, Supervisor Carson, Mayor Bates, and Councilmembers Anderson, Capitelli, Maio, Wengraf, and Wozniak in supporting my re-election.

www.MooreForDistrict2.com

10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley:
   - Nicky González Yuen, Trustee, Peralta Colleges Bd
   - Weldon Rucker, Former Berkeley City Manager/District 2 Neighbor
   - Irma Parker, Parent Liaison at BUSD
   - Eve Uberman, Nia House Director
   - Karen Hemphill, Berkeley School Boardmember/District 2 Neighbor
   - Beatriz Leyva-Cutler, Berkeley School Boardmember
   - Leah Wilson, Berkeley School Boardmember
   - Josh Daniels, Berkeley School Boardmember
   - Darlene Percoats, Executive Director, Childhood Education Center (CEC)
   - Michael M. Anthony, Neighborhood Leader/District 2 Neighbor
   - Winston Burton, Berkeley Board of Library Trustees, Chair
   - Christine Staples, PTA President, Martin Luther King Jr. Middle School/District 2 Neighbor
   - Judy Appel, Executive Director, Our Family Coalition/School Board Director, Candidate
   - Phil Catalfo, Waterfront Commissioner
   - Paul McElwee, West Alcatraz Neighborhood Association
   - Arlene Key, Chair of San Pablo Neighborhood Council Assoc. Inc
   - Sheila Kolenc, President Blake & Mabel Neighborhood Assn
   - Lisa Duncan, President, Curtis-Chaucer Neighborhood Association
   - Charlene Washington, San Pablo Park Neighbor
   - Reginald Johnson, Co-Founder, music group “Panopoly”/District 2 Neighbor

s/DARRYL MOORE
I, MAXWELL G. ANDERSON, JR, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Berkeley, and make the following statement:

1. That my name is Maxwell G. Anderson, Jr.
2. The office for which I am a candidate is City Council, District 3
3. That my residence is 1901 Alcatraz Avenue; Berkeley, CA 94703
4. The place of my birth is Decatur, IL.
5. My present occupation is Registered Nurse, Retired.
7. Record of community service: Member/former member, Sierra Club; Bargaining Team, CA Nurses Association. Present/former Board member, Biotech Partners; League of Conservation Voters; South Berkeley Neighborhood Development Corporation.
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.
9. During my tenure on City Council, we have greatly improved traffic conditions on our residential streets with the addition of beacon lights at the intersections of Adeline and Harmon and at Ashby and Ellis. I have helped lead the effort to double the number of summer jobs available for our youth. By working with Neighborhood Associations, other constituent groups and the police department, I continue striving to improve law enforcement and crime prevention efforts. The alterations of Derby Street will allow the construction of regulation baseball fields and other playing fields. Through the urging of my office, Public Works focused repair efforts that eliminated the repeated flooding below MLK. We’ve had the entire length of MLK repaved making it safer for pedestrians, bicyclists and drivers. I was a strong and successful advocate for the Hypertension Drop-In Clinic at the Over 60’s facility at Sacramento and Alcatraz, the Malcolm X Arts Collaborative, the Youth Spirit Art Works, the Ed Roberts Campus, the new South Berkeley Library, and to retain the South Berkeley Post Office in the face of its threatened closure. This summer we will bring the Breathmobile to our community to address the growing number of asthmatic children.
10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley:
   Larry Bensky (Lawrence M. Bensky), Journalist, Teacher
   Mary Elieiser
   Nathan Glesper, Retired Principal
   Marcy Greenhut, Environmental Programs Technician
   Mansour Id-Deen, Program Director
   Carole Kennerly, Former Vice Mayor of Berkeley
   Jean Rowe Lieber, RN, NP (ret)
   J. George Lippman, Chair, Berkeley Peace and Justice Commission
   Mel Martyyn, teacher
   Susi Marzuola, Architect
   Linda Olivenbaum, Early Childhood Educator
   Karl J. Reeh, President LeConte Neighborhood Assn.
   Cary Sanders, Former President, LeConte PTA
   John T. Selawsky, President, Berkeley School Board
   Richie Smith, Commission on Ageing
   Pamela Speich, Chairperson, Berkeley Community Health Commission
   Peter Waller, Architect
   Pam Webster, Berkeley Rent Stabilization Board Commissioner
   Margy Wilkinson, South Berkeley Resident
   Leah Wilson, Vice President Berkeley School Board

s/MAXWELL G. ANDERSON, JR
I, DMITRI BELSER, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Berkeley, and make the following statement:

1. That my name is Dmitri Belser
2. The office for which I am a candidate is City Councilmember, District Three
3. That my residence is 2024 Parker Street, Berkeley California 94704
4. The place of my birth is Brookline Massachusetts
5. My present occupation is Executive Director, Center for Accessible Technology
6. I have held the following public offices: Commissioner, City of Berkeley Commission on Disability
7. Record of community service: President, Ed Roberts Campus. Board Treasurer, Building Education Center. Board Secretary, Arrowsmith Academy. Board Secretary, Computer Technologies Program. Member, Adeline-Alcatraz Merchants Association.
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.

9. South Berkeley is a vibrant neighborhood, beautiful and diverse. But it also needs to be a safe place for the residents, with thriving commercial areas. I believe District Three needs a Councilmember who is responsive, willing to get involved and react to problems and opportunities as they arise. As President of the Ed Roberts Campus, I managed the design, fundraising and construction, working with BART, the City of Berkeley, the neighborhood and the various agencies involved in the project. This has informed my vision for Berkeley: diverse groups collaborating to get things done. We found that the whole was bigger than the sum of the parts, and I was honored to lead that successful effort. My partner and I have restored six historic houses in the District, raised our children here, and lived here for 24 years. I’ve seen how addressing blighted properties can help turn a neighborhood around. The disability community again needs a voice on the City Council to ensure that the City remain accessible for all our citizens. I may be blind, but I have a vision for the City of Berkeley. I invite you to join me in creating that vision. Visit dmitri4council.com to learn more.

10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley:
   Laurie Capitelli, Berkeley City Councilmember
   Zona Roberts, Community Activist
   Mary Lou Breslin, Senior Policy Advisor - Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund (DREDF)
   Susan Henderson, President, Ed Roberts Campus; (for identification purposes only)
   Madelyn Stelmach, Commissioner, Commission on Disability
   Iris Starr, City Planner
   Joan Leon, resident, Consultant
   Joan L Breves, Executive Director, Computer Technologies Program
   Ken Stein, Program Administrator, City of S.F. Mayor’s Office on Disability
   Nancy Ferreyra, Disability Advocate, Bookkeeper
   Joan Starr, Digital Librarian
   Marilyn Golden, Senior Policy Analyst, Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund

s/DMITRI BELSER
Candidate for MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL, DISTRICT 5

I, LAURIE CAPITELLI, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Berkeley, and make the following statement:

1. That my name is Laurie Capitelli
2. The office for which I am a candidate is Berkeley City Council, District 5
3. That my residence is 1767 Sonoma Avenue, Berkeley, CA 94707
4. The place of my birth is Palo Alto, California
5. My present occupation is City Councilmember/Businessman
6. I have held the following public offices: City Councilmember, District 5; Chair, Planning Commission; Chair, Zoning Adjustments Board; Member, Community Advisory Committee for Water Emergency Transportation Agency; Board Member, Alameda County Transportation Commission
7. Record of community service: Board member & past president, Berkeley Public Education Foundation; Vice President, Elmwood Theater Foundation; Delegate, Association of Bay Area Governments; Co-Founder Red Oak Opportunity Foundation
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.
9. My continuing commitment to District 5 is for a Berkeley that works. I want to preserve and enhance the qualities that make North Berkeley so wonderful: liveable/walkable neighborhoods, safe streets and vibrant commercial districts. I have worked with residents to mitigate impacts of the north Shattuck Safeway, with businesses to streamline new business permitting and collaborated with families to improve our local parks. I persuaded my Council colleagues to fully fund the 2008 library bond and campaigned actively to see our North Branch Library completely renovated. My District 5 office reliably provides constituent assistance and local information. Citywide, I look forward to continuing my work to provide a more welcoming downtown. As Berkeley's representative on Alameda County's Transportation Commission, I secured new bike and pedestrian improvements and supported the renovation of the I80/Gilman interchange. I will continue to support Berkeley's public schools and tap the intellectual resources of Cal to make Berkeley a better city. I am proud that through our recent economic challenges, Berkeley has maintained balanced budgets, is tackling long term financial obligations, is addressing infrastructure needs and has experienced a significant decrease in crime. I am honored to have your trust and support.
10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley:
   Tom Bates, Mayor, City of Berkeley
   Linda Maio, Vice-Mayor
   Darryl G. Moore, Berkeley City Councilmember, District 2
   Susan Wengraf, Berkeley City Councilmember, District 6
   Gordon Wozniak, Berkeley City Councilmember, District 8
   Loni Hancock, State Senator
   Nancy Skinner, Assemblymember
   Sheila Jordan, Alameda County Superintendent of Schools
   Joaquin J. Rivera, Vice-President, Alameda County Board of Education
   Karen Hemphill, Berkeley School Board Director
   Beatriz Leyva Cutler, Berkeley School Board Director
   Steve Baker, Executive Director Freight & Salvage Coffeehouse
   Helen Meyer, Business Owner
   Shirley Issel, Berkeley School Board Director, ret.
   Karen McKie, Artist, Public Education Advocate
   Terry Powell, former Berkeley Public Library Trustee, Library Foundation Boardmember, YMCA boardmember, LBNL employee (retired)
   Amy Thomas, Owner, Pegasus Books
   Harry Pollack, General Counsel, Save the Redwoods League (for identification purposes only)
   Michele Lawrence, Superintendent Berkeley Schools (Retired)
   Susan Medak, Managing Director, Berkeley Repertory Theater, for purposes of identification only

s/LAURIE CAPITELLI

BCC5-1
Candidate for MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL, DISTRICT 5

I, SOPHIE HAHN, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Berkeley, and make the following statement:

1. That my name is Sophie Hahn
2. The office for which I am a candidate is Berkeley City Council, District 5
3. That my residence is 1130 Shattuck Avenue, Berkeley, CA 94707
4. The place of my birth is Wilmington, Delaware
5. My present occupation is Zoning Commissioner and Community Leader
6. I have held the following public offices: Berkeley Zoning Adjustments Board; Chair, City of Berkeley Commission on the Status of Women; Chair, School Governance Council, King Middle School
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.

9. I am running as a call to service for the City I love. Berkeley is an amazing place, but needs to be revitalized. Streets, parks and commercial areas have declined, small businesses lack comprehensive support, and we are behind on important environmental initiatives. A former attorney and small business owner, BHS, UCB and Stanford Law graduate, I serve on the Zoning Board and am a leader for schools, libraries, urban agriculture, equity, sustainability and the arts. I bring excellence in problem solving, community building and governance, and a reputation for fairness, accessibility and results. Let’s transform Solano, Berkeley’s poorest performing commercial district, into a vibrant Main Street. Downtown, I will advocate for long-desired streetscape, transportation and parking improvements to revive the heart of our city. As your full-time Councilwoman, representing neighborhoods where I grew up and am raising my children, I will personally respond to constituent concerns. Together we can effectively address pedestrian and bike safety, disaster preparedness and crime watch. Berkeley needs a new generation of leaders to champion a sustainable city and meet fiscal challenges. Please join me for a new era of excellence: a Berkeley as vibrant and visionary as the people who live here. www.sophiehahn.com

10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley:
   Jesse Arreguin, Berkeley City Councilmember
   Max Anderson, Berkeley City Councilmember
   Leah Wilson, Vice-President, Berkeley School Board
   Alice Waters, Restauranteur and Food Activist
   Annie Leonard, Author, the Story of Stuff
   Abigail Franklin, Vice Chair, Board of Library Trustees, Berkeley
   Patrick Sheahan, Planning Commissioner, City of Berkeley
   Gene Poschman, Planning Commissioner; Past Chair, Zoning Adjustments Board and Budget Review Committee; Member, Downtown Area Plan Advisory Committee
   Patti Dacey, Planning Commissioner; Former Commissioner, Landmarks Preservation and Public Works Commissions, City of Berkeley
   Sara Shumer, Zoning Adjustments Board
   Carrie Olson, Chair, City of Berkeley Landmarks Preservation Commission; President, Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association; Member, City of Berkeley Design Review Committee
   Ellen L. Hahn, Board Member, Berkeley Symphony Orchestra; Past President, U.C. Berkeley Section Club and Berkeley Piano Club
   Shirley Dean, Former Mayor and District 5 Council Member, City of Berkeley
   Carole Davis Kennerly, Former Berkeley Vice Mayor and Councilmember
   Anna De León, Past President, Berkeley School Board; Small Business Owner
   Jesse Townley, Former Chair and Vice Chair, Disaster and Fire Safety Commission
   Willow Rosenthal, Founder and Former Executive Director, City Slicker Farms; Author, the Essential Urban Farmer
   Thomas G. Kelly, Director, KyotoUSA and HELIOS Project (Helios Energy Lights Our Schools); Solar Advocate
   Jacque Ensign, First President of Berkeley Path Wanderers Association
   Ann B. Williams, Former PTA President, Cragmont Elementary School and King Middle School

s/SOPHIE HAHN
1. That my name is Susan Wengraf
2. The office for which I am a candidate is City Council, District 6
3. That my residence is 1404 Le Roy Avenue, Berkeley, CA 94708
4. The place of my birth is Brooklyn, N.Y.
5. My present occupation is Berkeley City Council member, District 6
6. I have held the following public offices: Berkeley City Council; Delegate, Association of Bay Area Governments; Delegate, League of California Cities; Chair, Planning Commission; Landmarks Commission; Commission on Homelessness; Chair, Density Bonus Subcommittee; Chair, University Avenue Strategic Plan; Member, Oakland Airport Community Noise Management Forum
7. Record of community service: Live Oak Neighborhood Association; Planned Parenthood; Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association; Options for Hillside; Save the Bay; Sierra Club; Friends of LeRoy Steps; Berkeley Democratic Club.
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.

9. As your council representative for the past four years, I have worked hard to be independent, accountable, responsive, and accessible. I respect your opinions and am always available to listen to your concerns. I take pride in being a strong advocate for your interests and in delivering effective constituent services. I practice a rational, thoughtful approach to municipal governance, and have the ability to build the alliances necessary to take action and get things done. I will continue to push for policies based on objective analysis, data, and measured outcomes. Berkeley faces difficult challenges: limited resources, lack of financial transparency; budget deficits; unfunded pension liabilities; educational and health disparities; failing streets and sewers; and struggling businesses. In the North Berkeley hills, we need to increase police patrols to reduce property crime; improve 911 response times; educate about fire and earthquake safety; broaden the emergency cache program; expand bus service; and preserve the character of our neighborhoods by protecting views and maintaining parks. I have the knowledge, experience, and skilled leadership to continue to represent you effectively on the council. I am honored to have the support of Senator Loni Hancock. I ask for your vote.

Please visit re-electwengraf.com

10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley:
Betty Olds, Former City Councilmember, District 6
Barbara C. Allen, Neighborhood WATCH, Neighbors for Fire Safety
Sylvia C. McLaughlin, Co-founder Save the Bay, Environmentalist
Tom Bates, Mayor, City of Berkeley
Laurie Capitelli, Berkeley City Councilmember
Gordon Wozniak, Berkeley City Councilmember
Shirley Issel, Former School Board Member
Linda Schacht, Berkeley Public Library Foundation
Harry Pollack, General Counsel, Save the Redwoods League
Joaquin J. Rivera, Vice-President, Alameda County Board of Education
Victoria Eisen, Chair, Planning Commission
Nicky González Yuen, Trustee, Peralta Colleges Board
Susan Medak, Managing Director, Berkeley Repertory Theatre
Peter Lydon, Hillside Association
Risa Kagan, MD, Physician
Nashua Katherine Kalil, Chair, Zero Waste Commission
Karen Weinstein, former Chair, Women’s Caucus, California Democratic Party
Phila Rogers, Writer, member Friends of the Berkeley Public Library
Nancy Skinner

s/SUSAN WENGRAF
1. That my name is Alejandro Soto-Vigil
2. The office for which I am a candidate is Berkeley Rent Stabilization Board Commissioner
3. That my residence is 1534 Berkeley Way, Berkeley, CA 94703
4. The place of my birth is Martinez, CA
5. My present occupation is Legislative Aide, Berkeley City Council
6. I have held the following public offices: Vice-Chair, Housing Advisory Commission (HAC); Member, HAC Community Development Block Grant Subcommittee; Member, HAC Relocation Ordinance Subcommittee; Commissioner, Public Works Commission; Commissioner, AC-Transit Accessibility Advisory Committee
7. Record of community service: Organizer, Honoring Dolores Huerta, 2012 Cesar Chavez Commemoration; President, Student Bar Association, University of the District of Columbia Law School; Founding Member, Richmond Progressive Alliance
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.
9. I’m a community-endorsed candidate for affordable housing. As a lifelong tenant, and father of two, I know how critical affordable housing and rent controls are to maintaining stable neighborhoods and diverse families in our city. If elected I’ll advocate for policies that strengthen tenant protections, improve the safety and habitability of rental housing, inform tenants and landlords of their rights and responsibilities, require earthquake retrofits, and promote recycling and energy efficiency in apartments. I’ve always sought creative solutions, especially for problems facing the most vulnerable among us. As a law student, I defended tenants against unfair eviction. As Legislative Aide, I organized actions to regain illegally withheld security deposits, supported tenants displaced by recent Berkeley fires, and problem-solved to stay evictions. As Vice-Chair of the Housing Advisory Commission, I lobbied to strengthen the Relocation Ordinance and advocated for more affordable housing funding. If elected, I’ll work to keep Berkeley a vibrant place where everyone can call home. I was selected by the 2012 Berkeley Affordable Housing Convention, a diverse coalition of tenants, landlords, and homeowners; Endorsed by Rent Board commissioners Stephens, Blake, Webster, Townley, and Harr; EBMUD Director Andy Katz; and Alameda County Supervisor Keith Carson.
10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley:
   Judy Shelton, Berkeley Rent Board Commissioner
   Igor Tregub, Berkeley Rent Board Commissioner; Housing Advisory Commissioner
   Asa Dodsworth, Rent Board Commissioner
   Jesse Arreguín, Berkeley City Councilmember, District 4
   Kriss Worthington, Berkeley City Councilmember District 7
   Max Anderson, Berkeley City Council District 3
   Beatriz Levya-Cutler, Berkeley School Board Member
   J. George Lippman, Chair, Peace and Justice Commission
   Leah Simon-Weisberg, Legal Director, Tenants Together
   Linda Franklin, Director of Alameda County WIC (Womens, Infants, & Childrens – Nutrition Counseling program); former Community Health Commissioner
   ‘boona cheema’, Ex Director of BOSS (Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency)
   Sally Hindman, Executive Director, Youth Spirit Artworks
   Daniel Tuchler, President, Cal Berkeley Democrats
   Alex Ghenis, Disability Rights Activist, Former Vice President for External Affairs, Berkeley Student Cooperative
   Winston Burton, Berkeley Board of Library Trustees, Chair
   Stephen Murphy, Attorney, Commissioner, Housing Advisory Commission
   Willie Phillips, Board Member of Resource Community Development
   Audrey Frey, Former Co-Director of Renters’ Legal Assistance
   Mary Rose Kaczorowski, Calif. Women’s Agenda Environmental Task Co-Chair
   Judy Ann Alberti, BCA, Former Rent Board Commissioner

s/ALEJANDRO SOTO-VIGIL
1. That my name is Judy Shelton
2. The office for which I am a candidate is Rent Stabilization Board Commissioner
3. That my residence is 2920 Hillegass #A
4. The place of my birth is Los Angeles
5. My present occupation is Rent Board Commissioner
6. I have held the following public offices: Rent Board Commissioner; Member, Outreach Committee; Member, Individual Rent Adjustment/Annual General Adjustment/Habitation Committee; Member, Eviction/Section 8/Foreclosure Committee/Member, Ad Hoc Committee on Smoke-Free Housing; Former Member and Chair of the Waivers Committee
7. Record of community service: Seeds Mediation Center, Berkeley Library Literacy Program, Volunteer Coordinator “No on 98” campaign, co-coordinated community involvement in Berkeley Honda Strike, Berkeley Schools Writer Coach
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.
9. I am a community-endorsed candidate for affordable housing. During my term, I have stressed justice and evenhandedness. I have worked to combat tenant harassment, evictions of below-market-rate renters, and habitability problems, emphasizing the need to retrofit seismically unsafe buildings. For small landlords I’ve initiated a special series of workshops to guide them through rent board regulations and help them avoid late-registration penalties. I’ve worked to improve every aspect of customer service. I am currently focused on dedicating a customer-service staffer to small property owners; organizing a habitability-issues workshop for tenants; and advocating at Sacramento for affordable housing legislation, especially legislation that allows cities more autonomy. This next term, I will continue to stress fairness. And I will continue to defend our rent control laws, which have helped make Berkeley a city we can all proudly call home. A diverse coalition of tenants, landlords and homeowners selected me at the 2012 Berkeley Affordable Housing Convention. Please join them and Commissioners Stephens, Blake, Webster, Townley and Harr, and EBMUD Director Andy Katz in voting for me.
10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley:
Alejandro Soto-Vigil, Vice-chair, Housing Advisory Commission & Affordable Housing Convention-Endorsed Candidate
Igor Tregub, Berkeley Rent Board Commissioner; Housing Advisory Commissioner; Affordable Housing Convention-Endorsed Candidate
Asa Dodsworth, Berkeley Rent Board Commission and Affordable Housing Convention-Endorsed Candidate
Max Anderson, City Council District 3
Jesse Arreguin, Berkeley City Council Member; former Chair, Berkeley Rent Board
Kriss Worthington, Berkeley City Council
John T. Selawsky, President, Berkeley School Board
Beatriz Levy-Cutler, Berkeley School Board Member
boona cheema, Ex. Director of BOSS
Deborah Matthews, City of Berkeley Commissioner Zoning Adjustment Board; Real Estate Broker
Willie Phillips, Board Member of Resource Community Development
Daniel Tuchler, President, Cal Berkeley Democrats
Mary Nicely, Asian American and Pacific Islander Community Advocate
Mary Rose Kaczorowski, Calif Women’s Agenda Environmental Task Co-Chair; Graduate Student
Alex Ghenis, Disability Rights Activist; former Vice President of External Affairs, Berkeley Student Cooperative
Judy Ann Alberti, BCA, former Rent Board Commissioner
Rick Lewis, Executive Director, Bay Area Community Land Trust
Leah Simon-Weisberg, Legal Director, Tenants Together
Winston Burton, Berkeley Board of Trustees, Chair
Patti Dacey, Planning Commissioner; Secretary, LeConte Neighborhood Association

s/JUDY SHELTON
Candidate for RENT STABILIZATION BOARD COMMISSIONER

I, KIRAN SHENOY, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Berkeley, and make the following statement:

1. That my name is Kiran Shenoy
2. The office for which I am a candidate is Rent Stabilization Board Commissioner
3. That my residence is 657 Colusa Ave., Berkeley, CA 94707
4. The place of my birth is Flint, Michigan
5. My present occupation is Attorney
6. I have held the following public offices: Berkeley Police Review Commissioner
7. Record of community service: I have served on the Berkeley Police Review Commission since 2010 and have served on the Mutual-Aid Pact, Use of Force and Outreach Subcommittees.
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.
9. I am a tenant and have been for the majority of my adult life. That is why I understand the importance of a strong Rent Control Ordinance like we have here in Berkeley. Though our Ordinance needs no change, as we move forward it is important that we ensure the Ordinance is administered properly. As a practicing attorney I realize that a governing body which makes quasi-judicial decisions, like the Rent Stabilization Board, must be impartial in order to maintain its legitimacy. It is also imperative that the Board provides oversight to guarantee its staff is operating with the utmost fiscal responsibility and fairness so it can continue to effectively serve the community. My time on the Berkeley Police Review Commission (PRC) gives me confidence that, if elected, I can do my part in achieving these goals. In the two and a half years since my appointment to the PRC I have served as Vice-Chair, Chair and on several important policy subcommittees. Working with the community has been my mantra, and I hope to do the same on the Rent Stabilization Board. Please visit www.BerkeleyTUFF.com to learn more about me and some of my endorsers. We need your vote!
10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley:
   Nicole Drake, Member of "Tenants United for Fairness" and Rent Board Commissioner
   Judy J. Hunt, Member of "Tenants United for Fairness" and Non-profit Executive
   Jay James, Member of "Tenants United for Fairness," Mechanical Engineer
   Linda Maio, Berkeley Vice-Mayor
   Darryl Moore, Berkeley City Council, District #2
   Susan Wengraf, Berkeley City Councilmember, District 6
   Gordon Wozniak, Berkeley City Councilmember, District 8
   Charlene Washington, San Pablo Park Neighbor

   s/KIRAN SHENOY
I, JUDY J. HUNT, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Berkeley, and make the following statement:

1. That my name is Judy J. Hunt
2. The office for which I am a candidate is Rent Stabilization Board Commissioner
3. That my residence is 1440 Eighth Street, Berkeley, CA 94710
4. The place of my birth is Alameda, CA
5. My present occupation is Non-profit Executive
6. I have held the following public offices: Commissioner, Alameda County Advisory Commission on Aging, 2006-2010
7. Record of community service: Alameda County Leadership Academy, 2004-2005; Poll worker, Alameda County Registrar of Voters; and Alumni Council Member, Head Royce School
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.
9. As a resident of West Berkeley, I see the impact of a community undergoing various changes. Aging adults, both tenants and property owners, choose to stay in their residences for as long as they can remain independent. Our elders need housing stability in their retirement years. Having served as a Commissioner on the Alameda County Advisory Commission on Aging, our older adults deserve the dignity of safe secure housing and income to maintain their rental properties. I bring experience as a tenant, an executive administrator with non-profit organizations, property owner and as a community volunteer. The Rent Stabilization Board needs to address issues related to housing stability, and policies that affect property maintenance and management. As a commissioner, I will work with colleagues to develop good governance; and management oversight to provide accountability of resources, and staff duties that align with the mission of the Board and the needs of the community. The Rent Stabilization Board needs the expertise of citizens who have vision and a commitment of fairness to both tenants and landlords. I was chosen to run on the “Berkeley Tenants United for Fairness” slate. Please visit www.BerkeleyTUFF.com to learn more about me and my endorsers.

10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley:
    Nicole Drake, Member of “Tenants United for Fairness” and Rent Board Commissioner
    Jay James, Member of “Tenants United for Fairness” and Mechanical Engineer
    Kiran Shenoy, Member of “Tenants United for Fairness,” Vice-Chair Police Review Commission
    Darryl Moore, Berkeley City Council, District #2
    Susan Wengraf, Berkeley City Council, District 6
    Gordon Wozniak, Berkeley City Councilmember, District 8

s/JUDY J. HUNT
I, IGOR A. TREGUB, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Berkeley, and make the following statement:

1. That my name is Igor A. Tregub
2. The office for which I am a candidate is Rent Stabilization Board Commissioner
3. That my residence is 1043 Virginia Street, Berkeley, CA 94710
4. The place of my birth is Kiev, Ukraine
5. My present occupation is Rent Board Commissioner/Housing Advisory Commissioner/Engineer
6. I have held the following public offices: Elected Commissioner, Berkeley Rent Stabilization Board; Chair, Budget and Personnel Committee; Member, IRA/AGA/Habitability Committee; Member, Eviction/Section 8/Foreclosure Committee; Member, Committee on Waivers; Member, Outreach Committee; Commissioner, Housing Advisory Commission; Member, Housing Trust Fund Subcommittee; Interim Commissioner, Berkeley Planning Commission; Chair, Berkeley Commission on Labor; Chair, Sweatshop-Free Subcommittee; Chair, Employment Non-Profits Funding Subcommittee; Chair, Living Wage and Earned Income Tax Credit Subcommittee; Member, Right-to-Know Ordinance Subcommittee; Undergraduate Representative, UC Chancellor’s Joint Oversight Committee on Parking and Transportation.
7. Record of community service: Sierra Club Northern Alameda County Executive Committee; ASUC Senator and City Affairs Advisor; Regional Council, Bend the Arc – Jewish Partnership for Justice; New Leaders Council
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.
9. I am a community-endorsed candidate for affordable housing. Four years ago you elected me to this Board. Since then, I have been a leader in advocating for more affordable, safe, and sustainable housing. My work successfully achieved revisions to the city’s Relocation Ordinance, with stronger protections for temporarily displaced tenants, and expanded outreach for landlords and tenants. I also effectively advocated for an ordinance requiring seismic retrofitting of apartment buildings. In response to the growing number of foreclosures, I organized a foreclosure prevention workshop for landlords, tenants, and homeowners, which received Rep. Barbara Lee’s Certificate of Congressional Recognition. There is still more work to be done, and we need to continue to defend rent control – Berkeley’s most successful affordable housing program – from attacks. If reelected, I will promote accountability and greater efficiency so the Rent Board can better serve tenants and landlords. I ask for your vote so that together we can continue to make housing more safe, livable, and affordable. A coalition of tenants, landlords, and homeowners selected me at the 2012 Berkeley Affordable Housing Convention. Endorsers include sitting Rent Board Commissioners Stephens, Blake, Webster, Townley, and Harr, EBMUD Director Andy Katz, and Supervisor Keith Carson.
10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley:
   Alejandro Soto-Vigil, Vice-Chair, Housing Advisory Commission and Berkeley Affordable Housing Convention-Endorsed Rent Board Candidate
   Judy Shelton, Berkeley Rent Board Commissioner and Affordable Housing Convention-Endorsed Candidate
   Asa Dodsworth, Rent Board Commissioner and Affordable Housing Convention-Endorsed Candidate
   Loni Hancock, State Senator
   Max Anderson, City Council District 3
   Jesse Arreguin, Berkeley City Councilmember; former Chair, Berkeley Rent Board
   Kriss Worthington, Berkeley City Council
   John T. Selawsky, President, Berkeley School Board
   Beatriz Leyva-Cutler, Berkeley School Board Member
   Beverly Greene, Mentor, Black Elected Officials & Faith Based Leaders of the East Bay
   Connor Landgraf, ASUC President
   Daniel Tuchler, President, Cal Berkeley Democrats
   Leah Simon-Weisberg, Legal Director, Tenants Together
   Deborah Matthews, Commissioner, City of Berkeley Zoning Adjustments Board
   Mary Nicely, Asian American and Pacific Islander Community Advocate
   Willie Phillips, Board Member of Resources for Community Development
   Boona Cheema, Executive Director of BOSS (Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency)
   Alex Ghenis, Disability Rights Activist; former Vice-President of External Affairs, Berkeley Student Cooperative
   Judy Ann Alberti, BCA, former Rent Board Commissioner
   Winston Burton, Berkeley Board of Library Trustees, Chair

s/IGOR A. TREGUB
Candidate for RENT STABILIZATION BOARD COMMISSIONER

I, ASA DODSWORTH, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Berkeley, and make the following statement:

1. That my name is Asa Dodsworth
2. The office for which I am a candidate is Rent Stabilization Board Commissioner
3. That my residence is 2185 Acton St
4. The place of my birth is Berkeley, California
5. My present occupation is Rent Stabilization Board Commissioner
6. I have held the following public offices: Berkeley Rent Board Commissioner; Chair, Waivers Committee; Member, Outreach Committee; Member, Safe & Sustainable Housing Committee; Member, Earthquake Safety Sub-Committee; member, Ad-Hoc Committee on Smoke Free Housing; Former Vice-Chair, Berkeley Zero Waste Commission
7. Record of community service: Dog/Cat Volunteer, Berkeley Animal Shelter; Food Not Bombs (11 years); Tutor, Berkeley Youth Alternatives; #OccupyTheFarm!; Co-Founder Permaculture Boot Camp; Berkeley Copwatch; Prison Literature Project.
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.
9. I am a community-endorsed candidate for affordable housing. Berkeley is my hometown and community. Having seen a loss of Berkeley’s diversity due to high housing costs, I’ve worked for rent control and Strong Tenant Protections. In my two years on the Rent Board, I’ve improved outreach to tenants and landlords, while strengthening Berkeley’s Disaster Preparedness & Fire Safety enforcement program. This has saved lives by relaying the City’s expectation that apartment buildings must include working smoke detectors and other common-sense measures. Along with many stakeholders, I’ve worked to develop a more effective and comprehensive citywide safety program. Anonymous complaints of fire hazards are currently not allowed under existing city regulations, nor is there the funding to do effective fire safety inspections in multi-unit properties. We should change this through a modest increase of the Rental Housing Safety Program Fee. I will keep fighting for you! My priorities include: Fire Safety, Earthquake Safety, and Environmental Incentives for Landlords and Tenants through Recycling and Composting. A coalition of tenants, landlords and homeowners selected me at the 2012 Berkeley Affordable Housing Convention. Endorsers include Commissioners Stephens, Blake, Webster, Townley, and Harr; and EBMUD Director Andy Katz. http://berkeleytenantconvention.net/

10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley:
   Alejandro Soto-Vigil, Vice Chair, Housing Advisory Commission; & Affordable Housing Convention Endorsed Candidate
   Igor Tregub, Berkeley Rent Board Commissioner; & Affordable Housing Convention Endorsed Candidate
   Judy Shelton, Rent Board Commissioner & Affordable Housing Convention-Endorsed Candidate
   Jesse Arreguin, Berkeley City Councilmember; former Chair, Berkeley Rent Board
   Max Anderson, City Council District 3
   Kriss Worthington, Berkeley City Councilmember
   John T. Selawsky, President, Berkeley School Board
   Beatriz Levy-Cutler, Berkeley School Board Member
   Daniel Tuchler, President, Cal Berkeley Democrats
   Leah Simon-Weisberg, Legal Director, Tenants Together
   ‘Boona Cheema’, Executive Director of BOSS (Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency)
   Deborah Matthews, Commissioner City of Berkeley Zoning Adjustment Board
   Alex Ghenis, Disability Rights Activist; former vice-president of External Affairs, Berkeley Student Cooperative
   Willie Phillips, Board Member of Resource Community Development
   Nancy Carleton, Former Chair, Zoning Board; Past President, Berkeley Partners for Parks; Co-Chair, Halcyon Neighborhood Association
   Linda Franklin, Director of Alameda County WIC (Women, Infants & Children Nutrition Counseling Program); Community Health Commissioner, Former
   Effie Rawlings, Biofuel Oasis Workers Co-op member; Cooperative Roots Non Profit Housing Board member; Co-Founder of Occupy the Farm; US Army Veteran
   Judith D Gips, KPFA Community Advisory Board Member; Environmental Research Associate; Food Not Bombs; School teacher
   Judy Ann Alberti, BCA, former Rent Board Commissioner
   Winston Burton, Berkeley Board of Library Trustees, Chair

s/ASA DODSWORTH
Candidate for RENT STABILIZATION BOARD COMMISSIONER

I, NICOLE DRAKE, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Berkeley, and make the following statement:

1. That my name is Nicole Drake
2. The office for which I am a candidate is Rent Stabilization Board Commissioner
3. That my residence is 1436 Carleton Street
4. The place of my birth is Dayton, Ohio
5. My present occupation is Legislative Aide to Berkeley Vice-Mayor Linda Maio
6. I have held the following public offices: Current Commissioner, Rent Stabilization Board; Commissioner and Vice-Chair, Housing Advisory Commission; Joint 4x4 City Council/Rent Board Housing Committee.
7. Record of community service: Former Mayor Dellums’ Task Force on Education; Volunteer, No More Tears, San Quentin reentry program; Organizer, United Students Against Sweatshops; Board, SOCAL Fair Trade Network.
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.

9. As a current Rent Board member, strong supporter of affordable housing, and tenant for over 10 years, I have worked to bring tenant/landlord mediation and fairness to the Board. I have brought recycling to multi-unit buildings, established a no-smoking ordinance, and pursued protections for tenants in unreinforced masonry buildings. I am seeking re-election to continue my work. On 6/25/2012, the Alameda County Civil Grand Jury issued a report and findings quite critical of the Agency’s hiring practices and lack of oversight over staff. “...the Grand Jury found that the (Agency) is a self-sustaining bureaucracy that operates without effective oversight and accountability.” Having personally advocated for more oversight, I am the only Board member that is concerned about and supportive of the Grand Jury’s findings. Berkeley citizens deserve an elected Commission that is competent and applies due diligence regarding its charge from the voters. In order to truly get the oversight and accountability as an elected board, we need board members committed to this, to good government, to fairness, and to transparency. I was chosen to run on “Berkeley Tenants United for Fairness” slate. For more information about my campaign and the Grand Jury’s findings, visit: www.BerkeleyTuff.com

10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley:
Kiran Shenoy, Member of “Tenants United for Fairness”, and Vice-Chair, Police Review Commission
Jay James, Member of “Tenants United for Fairness” and Mechanical Engineer
Judy J. Hunt, Member of “Tenants United for Fairness” and Non-profit Executive
Tom Bates, Mayor, City of Berkeley
Linda Maio, Berkeley Vice-Mayor
Darryl Moore, Berkeley City Councilmember, District 2
Laurie Capitelli, Berkeley City Councilmember, District 5
Susan Wengraf, Berkeley City Councilmember, District 6
Gordon Wozniak, Berkeley City Councilmember, District 8
Charlene Washington, San Pablo Park Neighbor
Yelda Bartlett, Chair, Berkeley Commission on the Status of Women
Pamela Gray, Chair, Parks & Recreation Commission
Anna Avellar, Animal Care Comm. Commissioner and Waterfront Commissioner
Ben Bartlett, Commissioner, Zero Waste Commission

s/NICOLE DRAKE
Candidate for RENT STABILIZATION BOARD COMMISSIONER

I, JAY JAMES, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Berkeley, and make the following statement:

1. That my name is Jay James
2. The office for which I am a candidate is Rent Stabilization Board Commissioner
3. That my residence is 2437 Shattuck Ave. #17 Berkeley CA 94704
4. The place of my birth is Berkeley
5. My present occupation is Mechanical Engineer
6. I have held the following public offices: None
7. Record of community service: The last 4 years I have been an officer and instructor for SEED. We teach after-school science courses to students in Berkeley and Oakland.
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.
9. In May of this year I finished my Ph.D. in Mechanical Engineering at U.C. Berkeley. As a renter in Berkeley for the past 6 years I witnessed the high cost and low quality of housing offered to students. The high turnover in the student population makes them particularly vulnerable to the issues many renters in Berkeley face. I hope to be an advocate for student renters and ensure the availability of high-quality, affordable housing in Berkeley. An Alameda County Grand Jury recently found Berkeley’s Rent Stabilization Board Agency to “operate without effective oversight and accountability.” In response, the concerns outlined in the report were brazenly dismissed. Unfortunately, without transparency and audits, the rent board agency’s spending and hiring policies the effectiveness of the board will continue to diminish. If elected I will push for greater oversight and treat the Grand Jury report as constructive rather than baseless criticism. I was chosen to run on the “Berkeley Tenants United for Fairness” slate. To find out more visit: www.BerkeleyTUFF.org
10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley:
   Nicole Drake, Member of “Tenants United for Fairness” and Rent Board Commissioner
   Judy J. Hunt, Member of “Tenants United for Fairness” and Non-profit Executive
   Kiran Shenoy, Member of “Tenants United for Fairness,” Vice-Chair Police Review Commission
   Linda Maio, Berkeley Vice-Mayor
   Darryl Moore, Berkeley City Council, District #2
   Susan Wengraf, Berkeley City Councilmember, District 6
   Gordon Wozniak, Berkeley City Councilmember, District 8

s/JAY JAMES
Candidate for SCHOOL BOARD DIRECTOR

I, JUDY APPEL, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Berkeley, and make the following statement:

1. That my name is Judy Appel
2. The office for which I am a candidate is School Board Director
3. That my residence is 1805 Stuart Street
4. The place of my birth is Van Nuys, California
5. My present occupation is Executive Director of nonprofit for families
6. I have held the following public offices: Member, San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, Community Representative to BUSD Superintendent’s Budget Advisory Task Force
7. Record of community service: Executive Director Our Family Coalition, Legal Director Drug Policy Alliance, Civil Rights Director Coalition on Homelessness, PTA president, site council chair, director on non-profit boards.
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.

9. As a seasoned nonprofit leader and mother of two BUSD students, I have the skills, insight and experience to help our district continue to grow and thrive. Our schools, much like our students, can achieve great things when we set high expectations, build systems to achieve our goals, and hold ourselves accountable to those goals. My priorities are 1) providing equity in education to all students, 2) aligning spending with district values and goals, 3) fostering safe and positive school climates that support student success, and 4) strengthening ties between school, family and community. With over 20 years directing social justice and family focused nonprofits, I understand fiscal management, human resources and policy development. I have worked with school districts throughout the state, including BUSD, on implementing positive behavioral curricula. I have served as PTA president, site governance chair, and on the Superintendent’s Budget Advisory Task Force. I believe that every child deserves the opportunity to be seen, valued and challenged at school, and I will provide the creative and proactive leadership to help make that happen. I am proud to have the endorsement of the teachers’ union, as well as many educators, parents and other community members. JudyAppel.org.

10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley:
   Loni Hancock, State Senator
   Nancy Skinner, Assemblymember
   Sheila Jordan, Superintendent of Alameda County Schools
   Joaquin J. Rivera, Vice-President, Alameda County Board of Education
   Tom Bates, Mayor
   Linda Maio, Vice Mayor and Berkeley City Councilmember
   Darryl Moore, Berkeley City Councilmember
   Max Anderson, Berkeley City Councilmember
   Jesse Arreguin, Berkeley City Councilmember
   Laurie Capitelli, Berkeley City Councilmember
   Susan Wengraf, Berkeley City Council
   Kriss Worthington, Berkeley City Councilmember
   Gordon Wozniak, Berkeley City Councilmember
   John T. Selawsky, President, Berkeley School Board
   Karen Hemphill, Berkeley School Board Director
   Beatriz Leyva-Cutler, Berkeley School Board Director
   Michele Lawrence, Superintendent Berkeley Schools (Retired)
   Santiago Casal, Co-Chair -- United in Action
   Cheryl Eccles, Former PTA President, Willard Middle School & Malcolm X
   Barry Fike, Teacher and Former President Berkeley Federation of Teachers

   s/JUDY APPEL
I, NORMA J F HARRISON, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Berkeley, and make the following statement:

1. That my name is Norma J F Harrison
2. The office for which I am a candidate is School Board Director
3. That my residence is 1312 Cornell, Berkeley, Ca. 94702
4. The place of my birth is Chicago, Il.
5. My present occupation is Realtor.
6. I have held the following public offices: None
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.

9. There needs to be a seat on the school board where we can discuss other than simple maintenance of some accepted (required) status quo. That’s my objective, to enable that discussion. To face capitalism’s procrustean system look at http://www.thebaffler.com/past/adam_wheeler_went_to_harvard/print. And further, look at “A Matter of Degrees,” August Harper’s Magazine. Both cite perversions of the competition system’s requirement of degrees from schools in order to achieve status and the concomitant material benefits, both required for some degree of comfort, and especially security, in capitalism. ...although that security is being taken back with something called erosion of the middle class, so that doctors’, teachers’, the upper echelon of employment’s access to power and comfort is sharply reducing. Too, the putative left turns on upper income, upper strata employees, albeit working class people like us all, our Owners continued success at ‘divide and conquer’. School, like jobs, is uncomfortable at all levels, including having to turn our child over to it so we can get to some location to make money to get along, the job. The discomfort is not unassailable. It is subject to our analysis, unification, and correction. http://normaharrisonforschoolboard.info. Do talk with me to consider the full spectrum of struggle.

10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley:
   Anna Cohen, Activist
   J. R. Challacombe
   Michael DeLacour, Union Member Boilermakers SEIU
   John Murcko, Attorney
   Celso Simão, Professor
   Rosko Ross, Natural Philosopher
   Leeza Vinogradov, Gray Panthers, Code Pink, Activist @ Large
   Jane Welford
   Carol Ruth Denney, Community activist
   Jennifer Galanis, Interior Designer
   Jeannne Dritz, Member of Gray Panthers
   Mel Martynn, teacher
   Marilyn Naparst
   Benji Friedman, Artist
   Arnold Passman, Activist
   Gray Brechin, Geographer
   Mary Ann Uribe, Chair of Peoples Park Forever Committee

s/NORMA J F HARRISON
Candidate for SCHOOL BOARD DIRECTOR

1. TRACY HOLLANDER, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Berkeley, and make the following statement:

1. That my name is Tracy Hollander
2. The office for which I am a candidate is School Board Director
3. That my residence is 1227 Josephine Street, Berkeley
4. The place of my birth is South Orange, NJ
5. My present occupation is Analyst
6. I have held the following public offices: None
7. Record of community service: President, PTA Rosa Parks; Secretary PTA Council; School Governance Council Rosa Parks; Secretary, PTA Longfellow; Superintendent’s Budget Advisory Committee; Organizer, Berkeley Organizing Congregations for Action.
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.
9. As a trained and credentialed teacher, combined with seven years as a BUSD parent I have experienced our schools from every angle. My professional experience in education includes serving as: both a classroom and substitute teacher, PTA President, PTA Council Secretary, Superintendent’s Budget Advisory Committee Member, School Governance Council member, volunteer classroom tutor and aide, and teaching assistant to students with disabilities. Our schools must meet the needs of all of our children not just some of them, because nothing is more important to a child’s future than a quality education. As your school boardmember I will devote considerable time and energy to ensure Berkeley’s educational system empowers all students to enjoy learning and explore their passions and gifts in order to lead them to a life of opportunity, choice and purpose. I will regularly visit school sites to gain a better understanding of each and every school. My first hand experience of day-to-day life in the classroom and my understanding of the impact of budget cuts and public policy in our schools will bring an informed, professional perspective to our school board. On November 6, Vote to put a Teacher on the School Board, Vote for me, Tracy Hollander.

www.TracyHollander2012.org

10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley:

Laurie Capitelli, Berkeley City Councilmember
Susan Wengraf, Berkeley City Councilmember, District 6
Mary Friedman, Former Executive Director, Berkeley Public Education Foundation
Shirley Dean, Former Mayor, City of Berkeley
John T. Selawsky, President, Berkeley School Board
Irene Hegarty, Former School Board Director
Pamela M. Doolan, Former Berkeley School Board President/Director; Former Teacher
Elizabeth Shaughnessy, Former Berkeley School Board President, Berkeley Chess School President
Lloyd C Lee, Former Berkeley School Board Director
Margot Reed, Former Berkeley PTA Council President; Labor Activist
Tom Killilea, President, Berkeley PTA Council; President, Save Berkeley Iceland, BUSD Parent, Berkeley High School
Patricia Mok, Secretary, Berkeley PTA Council; Former President, Jefferson School PTA; BUSD Parent – Jefferson Elementary & King Middle School
Paz Alejandra Meléndez-Canales, President, English Learners Advisory Committee, PTA Communications, LeConte Elementary, Computing Services, Haas School of Business, UC Berkeley
Sam Frankel, BUSD Teacher; BFT Representative to Berkeley PTA Council
Michael A. Smith, Pastor
Scott Blake, Community Health Organizer/BOCA Board Member (Berkeley Organizing Congregations for Action)
Mark van Krieken, Chair, Cragmont Rebuilding Committee; Co-Founder, Berkeley Prenatal-to-Preschool Initiative; Former PTSA President, Berkeley High School
Fred Collignon, Professor Emeritus UC Berkeley; Former City Councilmember
Amy Stelmach Frey, Vice Principal at Berkeley High School 2005-2011
Tyra Herr, Education Specialist Berkeley Unified School District

s/TRACY HOLLANDER
I, BEATRIZ LEYVA-CUTLER, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Berkeley, and make the following statement:

1. That my name is Beatriz Leyva-Cutter
2. The office for which I am a candidate is Berkeley School Board Director
3. That my residence is 1617 8th Street, Berkeley CA 94710
4. The place of my birth is San Francisco, CA
5. My present occupation is Educator
6. I have held the following public offices: Elected Berkeley School Board Director from 2009 to 2012. Appointed by Berkeley Councilmember to be on the Early Childhood Task Force in 1997 now the City of Berkeley Early Childhood Commission.
7. Record of community service: For over 32 years I have been working for the only Latino nonprofit in Berkeley focused on providing bilingual child development services to children.
8. I am a taxpayer in the City of Berkeley.

9. With your vote I will continue advancing school achievement by supporting teacher and staff excellence based upon best practices and professional development and consistently implementing high academic standards across our school district. 12 out of 16 of our K-12 schools surpass the State standard for excellence and while much is still to be done to bridge the achievement gap, our African-American and Latino student’s graduation rate surpasses the County/State average for students of all ethnicities. I have advocated retaining our pre-school programs for working families and Adult Education. At Berkeley High, I have focused on attendance/truancy and consistent academic standards. I have worked with community leaders to overwhelmingly pass two school parcel taxes and a construction bond measure which is the basis for BUSD’s small class sizes and excellent school facilities. I meet regularly with our school community on issues such as school excellence, district budget, bilingual education, bullying and school safety. I am an involved, committed board and community member. Your vote allows me to continue the work that our teachers, staff, parents, board and community have started and are focused upon, the academic success and growth for all our students. Gracias!

10. I refer to the following residents of the City of Berkeley:
   Loni Hancock, State Senator
   Nancy Skinner, Assemblymember
   Tom Bates, Mayor, City of Berkeley
   Linda Maio, Vice Mayor
   Maxwell G. Anderson Jr, Berkeley City Council District 3
   Jesse Arreguín, Berkeley City Council
   Darryl Moore, Berkeley City Council
   Gordon Wozniak, Berkeley City Councilmember
   Laurie Capitelli, Berkeley City Council
   Leah Wilson, Vice-President BUSD School Board
   Josh Daniels, Berkeley School Board Member
   Karen Hemphill, Berkeley School Board Director
   Nancy Riddle, Former School Board Member
   Shirley Issel, former school board member
   Maria Sonia Carriedo, Berkeley Resident
   Michael McBride, Pastor
   Albert Lopez, Berkeley Parent
   Irma Parker, Parent Liaison
   Santiago Casal, Co-Chair United in Action

s/BEATRIZ LEYVA-CUTLER
Candidate’s Statement
CITY OF DUBLIN
Mayor

TIM SBRANTI
Occupation: Mayor/Teacher
Age: 37

My education and qualifications are: It has been an honor to work on your behalf as Mayor since 2008, and I hope for the opportunity to serve my hometown for one final term. Dublin has thrived in recent years through strategic planning, producing a sustainable balance of well-designed residential, retail, and office projects complemented by high-quality parks, trails, open space, and recreational facilities. Despite the major economic downturn, we still filled large commercial vacancies, attracted new businesses, completed major capital improvement projects, reformed our pension system, and increased efficiency to eliminate our structural budget deficit. This ultimately generated a surplus to restore previous cuts and increase investments in public safety, infrastructure, and parks. I am proud Dublin recently was the only city in California designated as an All-American City, and I believe it’s important to build upon our recent successes to keep Dublin moving forward in a positive direction. My goals are to continue working with you in a collaborative and accessible manner to achieve the City’s Strategic Initiatives of attracting and retaining jobs, developing a pedestrian-friendly downtown, improving Dublin’s communication and environmental practices, and creating dynamic cultural and recreational opportunities. I respectfully ask for your support.
CITY OF DUBLIN
Councilmembers

SHAWN COSTELLO
Occupation: Unemployed
Age: 50
My education and qualifications are: Hi I am Shawn Costello I have lived in Dublin for 28 years, I am running for Office because I love this city and I want it to grow in the right ways. We are growing too fast and the traffic is too much for our little town, and everyone must slow down our driving so that no one get hit We need to slow down our growth so we can save our wild life we have here, they have a right to live here too. I am for the kids in our schools; they need better teachers and better schools. The kids are our future. I am for the bus company’s that drive through our street’s, they need more funding to get the better driver’s and better bus’s, we also take the bus more to save on the high gas prices for the environment. I am for the elderly and low income families; we need more low income housing, and all people should qualify for housing no matter their income. I am for the businesses here in Dublin, I want to see more businesses hire more people that live here, and I want them to hire more disabled persons.

DOREEN WEHRENBERG
Occupation: Senior Project Manager
My education and qualifications are: I currently chair the Planning Commission and have served the city for eight years. My children attended Dublin schools. My husband and I have lived in Dublin for more than twenty years. As your City Council representative you can depend on me to improve our essential city services to preserve the safety and security of our residents. I am excited about Dublin’s growth and am proud of my contribution to the excellent financial health of our city. My professional experience as a Senior Project Manager for a health care organization includes planning, budgeting, contracts, negotiating, and working with regulatory agencies. I am committed to education and to contributing on a broader scale to a vibrant, safe, and clean, Dublin. Thank you for your vote. For more information, please visit my website at www.DoreenforDublin.com or email me at DoreenforDublin@gmail.com.

DAVID G. HAUBERT
Occupation: Member, Dublin Unified School Board of Trustees
My education and qualifications are: For the past 10 years I’ve enjoyed the privilege of serving the Dublin community as an elected member of the Dublin Unified School District Board of Trustees. Together, we have accomplished much. First, district-wide test scores have increased dramatically, with all Dublin schools showing steady increases. Students are learning more and the district is more successful than ever. Second, new schools have been built on time and under budget and we have modernized our aging facilities. Third, we have balanced our budget every year despite declining state funding. Dublin is already a well-run city, but we can make it even better. Now more than ever Dublin needs strong leaders and I have a proven record of success. I promise to fight hard to improve the quality of life in Dublin by focusing on improving community services, balancing the city’s budget every year, and creating new jobs and economic development. I’m very proud to call Dublin home where my wife, Michele, and I raise our three daughters. I’m supported by many current and past Dublin leaders and I’m honored to have your vote. For more information, please visit my web-site at www.davidhaubert.com or call me at (925) 719-8735. Please vote for David Haubert for Dublin City Council.

SHEHU SOLOMON HASSAN
Occupation: Executive Recruiter
My education and qualifications are: I am an executive recruiter with a strong background in business and public service. I have served as President of a medical services company in Dublin and as a CEO of an office furniture and manufacturing company. I held management positions at several tech companies; served on the board of Holy Family Day Home - the oldest early educational institution in CA. I was instrumental in helping raise over $5M for the capital project. I received a commendation of service from Sunnyvale School District. I was one of the early champions of bringing internet into the classrooms. I currently serve as a volunteer on both the international and program board of the Commonwealth Club of CA. I have BA degree from San Jose State University; certificate from U.C. Berkeley and attended the University of Denver graduate school. When elected I will promote partnerships between city and private industry, encourage sensible growth while maintaining high standards of public safety, and find ways to attract companies that provide high paying jobs to citizens. I will also encourage greener buildings; maintain a balance between residential growth and commercial growth while maintaining a strong financial foundation.
KEVIN E. HART
Occupation: Incumbent/Retired Sheriff’s Commander
Age: 53
My education and qualifications are: Dublin remains the best place to live, work and play in the San Francisco Bay Area. For the past four years, I have had the honor of serving as your Councilmember. If reelected, Dublin will continue be a place where families can live safely with economic opportunities, good-paying jobs, a revitalized downtown, improved quality of life, great schools, parks, and where maintaining a high degree of public safety is expected. We must have results-based governance with accomplishments and the Dublin City Council must execute a vision for the future. We must think smart, plan our growth and measure our progress. We must make hard choices and difficult decisions that will affect the entire city. We must protect ourselves from growing too quickly, without proper resources and infrastructure. We must plan strategically with sustainable development, with thriving neighborhoods that are close to schools, parks and other amenities. We must bring high value employers to the city with higher paying jobs. We must continue to bring new businesses to Dublin while continuing to help existing businesses prosper. I have 34 years experience in law enforcement and a veteran of the Dublin Unified School District Board of Trustees. I ask for your vote on November 6, 2012
Candidates’ Statements
CITY OF FREMONT
Mayor

STEVE CHO
Occupation: Retired Business Owner
Age: 62
My education and qualifications are: As your former councilmember for eight years, I diligently worked to ensure your concerns were voiced at council meetings. I am a native Californian and Fremont has been our home for almost 40 years. We have a well respected school district that offers quality education for our children. Fremont offers numerous profitable opportunities for employers to bring their businesses here. Like other cities, Fremont today faces similar economic challenges. Challenges create opportunities for us to work together and grow into an even stronger community. Changing and focusing Fremont into a more successful future means making the decision to change leadership. People want us candidates to keep our promises. With my daughter now an M.D. and me being retired, I will be a full-time Mayor for Fremont; reaching out to all citizens and business owners to ensure we are meeting our community’s needs. If you have similar thoughts, that Fremont has great potential, that new leadership is important and necessary for us to build new paths for working together, then I ask for your support and your vote. My campaign is about the quality of life for all of us. It is For The People. It is For You!

AZIZ AKBARI
Occupation: Engineering Student
My education and qualifications are: Fremont needs a bold plan for our future, and a dedicated leader who can develop such a plan and put it into action. As mayor, I will strive to establish Fremont as a prime location for innovation, business, learning and safe living. I will attract large and small technology and biotech companies, as well as startups to set up their headquarters here. This would bring jobs and tax revenue for Fremont. I will continue the development of Fremont’s downtown and Pacific Commons, bringing new offices, retail and dining options to Fremont. I will invest the resources required to bring new technologies to classrooms, hire more teachers, and to expand after school activities so that Fremont’s students can succeed in all aspects of their lives and become tomorrow’s leaders. I also stand strong with the residents of the Niles, Mission, Centerville, and other historic districts to preserve the rich history of Fremont, and in collaboration with East Bay Regional Parks, I will improve the beautiful parks in our city. Fremont is a great city with a tremendous potential. I aspire to serve and transform this beautiful city into one of the most sought after places in the country.

BILL HARRISON
Occupation: Business Owner/CPA and Fremont Councilmember
Age: 43
My education and qualifications are: Growing up in Fremont, my parents showed me how to be a leader. They, along with my friend and former Mayor, Bob Wasserman, taught me the importance of giving back and how to make our City even better. I’ve applied those lessons of leadership running our family accounting business and serving on the City Council. During my service, Fremont has become a regional hub for emerging technologies, and has received millions of dollars for transportation and infrastructure projects, including the BART extension to Warm Springs. I’m proud to have been born and raised in Fremont, and my wife and I are raising our children here. They attend Fremont’s great public schools, just like I did. As Mayor, I will work to protect small businesses, bring high-paying jobs to Fremont, provide the best schools for our children, and create a safer community by investing in public safety and our neighborhoods. My vision for Fremont is simple, a City that offers ALL residents a great place to live, work, shop, play, and raise a family. As a father, small business owner, and Councilmember, I will work with you to move Fremont forward to a brighter future. I’d appreciate your vote. www.HarrisonforFremont.com (510) 790-6071

ANU NATARAJAN
Occupation: Vice-Mayor/Civic Program Director
My education and qualifications are: I am running for Mayor to move Fremont forward and lead our city to a brighter future. As your Vice-Mayor and Councilmember for the past eight years, a former architect and professional planner, I have the vision, experience, energy and know-how to make Fremont a thriving, healthy, creative and inclusive city. As your Councilmember, I have focused on making Fremont the regional hub for green technology businesses and bringing new retail and entertainment opportunities to Fremont. As your Mayor, I will drive economic development by attracting high-tech and innovative companies around our future Warm Springs BART Station, creating a vibrant downtown and strengthening our existing local businesses. I believe the foundation of our great city is our neighborhoods with thriving community parks, well-maintained streets, great schools, a focus on arts and culture and a strong sense of community. I will protect our strong neighborhoods by ensuring that police and fire have the resources needed to keep us safe. As a mother of a young child, I want to create the best Fremont possible for the next generation. Together, we can achieve all that we dream for our community. I respectfully ask for your vote on November 6th. www.anu4fremont.com
JOHN DUTRA
Occupation: Economic Development Commissioner and Small Business Owner
My education and qualifications are: I’m proud to call Fremont home. Fremont is where I run the family company that my parents, John and Bernie, began more than 40 years ago. It’s where AnnMarie and I chose to raise our family. Early on, I was taught the importance of public service, leadership, decision-making and having an independent voice. I’m running for City Council to give back to a community that has given us so much and to make Fremont an even better place to live, work and raise a family. As a father, I see how strong schools enrich our community. That’s why I’ll be a vocal advocate for communication between the City Council and School Board, supporting education and programs that benefit and protect our children. As an Economic Development Commissioner and owner of a small business, I know what it takes to attract quality businesses that will set up shop, stay here and grow. While we work to create a destination city with a thriving downtown, we must always cherish and protect our baylands, hillsides and open spaces. I’m confident that my leadership and experience will bring our community together to help realize Fremont’s fullest potential. I respectfully ask for your vote. www.DutraforFremont.com

RAKESH SHARMA
Occupation: Retired Cancer Research Negotiator, and School Resource Officer at Washington High School
Age: 63
My education and qualifications are: Fremont has been my home for 25 years. As Fremont Planning Commissioner, I participated in developing General Plan 2030, supported businesses and affordable housing, protected our hills, and helped revitalize our historic districts. I was Niles Rotary President, and am Ohlone College Citizens’ Bond Oversight Committee Chair and founding President of IndoABC, an organization that has donated $400,000 to local charities. I organize health fairs and deliver Meals on Wheels. A proud product of public education, I earned my doctorate from a medical college. Having also lived in Japan, the Caribbean, and Texas, I have a global perspective. For 18 years, I researched at Stanford University. My experiences and tenure on multiple governing bodies affords me a strong understanding of how government works. As your Councilmember, I’ll bring jobs and businesses to Fremont, improve city services, and be open to ideas and concerns of my fellow community members. By organizing neighborhood meetings, I’ll encourage dialogues between residents and city government. Having been an avid marathon runner, I know how to set goals, make plans, and effectively accomplish tasks. I’m the people’s candidate, committed to serve Fremont with integrity and dedication. I’d be honored to have your support and vote. www.ElectSharma.com

SUZANNE “SUE” CHAN
Occupation: Councilmember/Businesswoman
My education and qualifications are: It has been my honor representing you as your Voice on City Council. My service has been fulfilling and challenging, but there’s more I want to do. Four years ago, our country fell into a economic pit – reduced state funding, decreased revenues and loss of redevelopment. Tough times required tough decisions to balance our budget and maintain basic services; but we did it. What’s important to you is important to me: Safe streets and homes; excellent schools, improved public safety, job creation, and economic development. On the Council I have fulfilled promises. After 4 years of work, we have new stores, restaurants, and theatres at Pacific Commons and the Block. Warm Springs/BART station will be the Power Hub of Innovation for Green and Clean Technology. Whole Foods will kick start the Downtown. These accomplishments came from vision, experience, and proven leadership – action and work -- not just words. I serve on many county, regional, state, and national commissions. These relationships have brought our fair share of resources back to Fremont. We’re climbing out. My work is not yet done. I would be honored to receive your vote for re-election as The Voice of Fremont on City Council. Thank you. www.suechanforfremont.com

RICK JONES
Occupation: Retired 29-year Fremont Police Officer, Hostage Negotiator, and School Resource Officer at Washington High School
Age: 55
My education and qualifications are: Violent crime is on the rise. We’re seeing criminals coming here from Oakland and Hayward. Fremont is at a critical point – we need to institute a zero tolerance for crime. As a retired 29-year Fremont police officer and a 32-year resident, I want to use my skills to serve you on the City Council. Before retiring, I was the School Resource Officer at Washington High School, responsible for heading off hate crime, bullying and gang confrontations for 2,200 students. I believe I made a difference. As your City Councilmember, I will institute a “zero tolerance” for crime and will identify funding sources to hire more officers. We need a strong truancy ordinance to keep kids in school and out of trouble. I will work with District Attorney Nancy O’Malley to prosecute parents who continually allow kids to cut school. Residents need to feel safe, especially at night. I am organizing “Volunteer Safety Officers” at grocery stores to safely walk shoppers to their cars at night. For more information call (510) 516-4860 or visit www.RickJonesforCityCouncil.com for locations. I am honored to be supported by the Fremont Police Association and would be honored to earn your support. Thank you.
VINNIE BACON

Occupation: Chief Technology Officer
Age: 51

My education and qualifications are: My long involvement in Fremont political life has always been as a representative of Fremont's citizens. I do not accept campaign contributions from developers. I promise to make development decisions based solely on the merits of any project, not on who funded my campaign. Despite warnings from the Superintendent of Schools, City Council approved a large residential development in Ardenwood where schools are already seriously overcrowded. There are no nearby schools for the students from this development, nor funding to build one. There is no excuse for this failure to plan properly! I will not support additional residential development unless we are assured the schools needed to accommodate such development are fully financed. Fremont has a history of approving residential development over building up Fremont’s businesses. Business owners complain it is difficult to do business in Fremont. This has seriously hurt Fremont’s economy. Bringing clean-tech and other jobs to Fremont will be my top priority. With Masters Degrees in City Planning and Transportation Engineering from UC Berkeley, 14 years of high-tech management experience, and as Vice-Chair of the Fremont’s Economic Development Advisory Commission, I have the experience needed to make Fremont successful. Detailed position papers available at www.bacon4fremont.com.
Candidate for COUNCILMEMBER, AT-LARGE

I, CAROL LEE TOLBERT, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Carol Lee Tolbert
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Councilmember, At-Large
3. My occupation for the past five years: Consultant
4. I have held the following public office: Oakland School Board Trustee – District 1

5. Statement of Qualifications: Dear Oakland Voter, I am an Oakland native, wife, and mother. I hold a Master’s Degree in Public Administration. I have a proven track record of leadership, advocacy and public service. As a former Oakland School Board member, I took the District out of State Receivership, left it with a $10 million surplus, and created quality neighborhood schools. I am a small business owner, educator, founder/volunteer of Oakland Civic Pride - a youth leadership program, and former nonprofit executive where I created jobs for Oakland residents. As your Councilmember At-Large, I will tackle the tough issues of public safety, jobs, school closures, youth and resident services, business growth, home ownership, and preserving our environment. Being the most dangerous city in California is unacceptable. You deserve better. Together we can make Oakland a great place to live, work and grow! Vote for me. I will be your voice at City Hall.

6. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

Gillette O. James
Michael LeBlanc
Sandra Yang
Linda R. Kegebein
Carolyn Sandidge
Cassandra Lopez
Thomas Scott
Lucella Harrison
Sylvester Brooks
Clifford Thompson
Chaplain Rufus Watkins
John Harrison, Esquire
Carole Watson
Dollene C. Jones
Willie Hamilton
Henry Linzie
Jimmy L. Williams
Tabette Hill
Donald L. Orviss

s/CAROL LEE TOLBERT
Candidate for COUNCILMEMBER, AT-LARGE

I, REBECCA KAPLAN, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Rebecca Kaplan
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Councilmember, At-Large
3. My occupation for the past five years: Councilmember, At-Large, Director, AC Transit
4. I have held the following public office(s): Oakland City Council, City of Oakland Public Safety Committee, City of Oakland Public Works Committee, City of Oakland Life Enrichment Committee, City/Port Liaison Committee, Association of Bay Area Governments Executive Board, Alameda County Waste Management Authority, Alameda County Transportation Commission, AC Transit Board of Directors, East Bay Economic Development Alliance Executive Board

5. Statement of Qualifications: Friends, Neighbors and Oaklanders: Thank you for electing me in November 2008 to serve as your citywide voice on the Oakland City Council. It’s been an honor to work to improve quality of life in our city, finding funding for police academies, pothole repair, senior centers, violence prevention and street lighting. I’m committed to protecting and strengthening the vital services you count on – and attracting business and transit-oriented development with local jobs. I’m fighting to get illegal guns off our streets and provide the police deployment that Oakland voted for. With your vote, I’ll continue efforts to stop violence, expand jobs and economic opportunity and provide accountable government. Please join the California Nurses Association, the Sierra Club and others in supporting my re-election. www.KaplanForOakland.org

6. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

   Daniel Buford
   Dorothy King
   H.E. Christian Peeples
   Geoffrey Pete
   Michael Colbruno
   Kemba Shakur
   Kathy Neal
   Richard Lee
   Edith Irons
   Eric Young

   Ada Chan
   Mario Juarez
   Christina Ramos

   s/REBECCA KAPLAN
Candidate for COUNCILMEMBER, AT-LARGE

I, MICK STORM, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Mick Storm
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Councilmember, At-Large
3. My occupation for the past five years: Software Engineering Manager

4. Statement of Qualifications: My name is Mick Storm. I am 40 years old and for the last 7 years I have worked as a Software Engineering Manager leading the Innovation Systems Group at Intuit, Inc. I have over 12 years of experience in leadership roles at high-tech organizations and start-ups around the bay area, including roles as Director of Engineering at Archetype-Solutions, and Multi-Media Specialist at NASA Ames Research Center. I studied Forestry Conservation Science and Anthropology at Humboldt State University. I am also a local musician and artist.

5. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

Bronwen LeMay
Sara West
Erica Mohan
Jennifer Moline
Gabriel Medina
Marcus Jefferson
Brian Berry
Chia C. Collins
Charles Vacin
Amanda Pfluger

Corissa Stobing
Eric Vacin
Michael Storm
Darwin Price

s/MICK STORM
Candidate for COUNCILMEMBER, AT-LARGE

I, THERESA ANDERSON, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Theresa Anderson
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Oakland City Councilmember, At-Large

3. Statement of Qualifications: I want to focus on healing our city in a leadership role. I am dedicated to Restorative Justice for our youth. I have fresh ideas that will carry Oakland to a better place such as; restore funding to youth programs and make it affordable for everyone. Implement wrap around services for the prison Realignment Program to bridge the gap to success. I will bring my ten years of experience working in the community as a leader, liaison and a mediator. As an Oakland native I have a strong community bond throughout Oakland. My dedication will continue as I work hard and diligently for a resolution to our City’s school closures by working closely to make sure policy is initiated to reinstate and sustain our public schools, and to advocate for ratification of a police commission as part of a plan to stop the growing crime rate and start reparative justice.

4. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

   Wilson Riles
   Omar Staples
   Michael Wallace
   Leon Ford
   Janet S. Arnold
   William Balderston
   Michael H. Rubin
   Gregory A. Jan
   Vicente Cruz II
   Torger T. Johnson
   Thearse Pecot
   Donald Macleay
   Randy Menjivar
   Rachel Tau
   Kyndria Thomas

s/THERESA ANDERSON
I, IGNACIO DE LA FUENTE, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Ignacio De La Fuente
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Oakland City Councilmember, At-Large
3. My occupation for the past five years: City Councilmember/ Labor Representative
4. I have held the following public office: City Councilmember, District 5

5. Statement of Qualifications: Oakland’s lost its way. Following a decade of growth, we’ve spent six years succumbing to immeasurable violence in our neighborhoods, and inane rhetoric at City Hall. As Council President, I worked with Mayor Jerry Brown; we set priorities, garnered support, and got things done. Since 2006, elected officials have become irrelevant to resident’s lives—regardless of neighborhood. I’m running for At-large councilmember to systematically address citywide issues. Over the years, I’ve proposed more beat cops, public safety initiatives, pension reform, less special taxes and an efficient and accountable administration – to no avail. It’s not too late. There council members won’t seek reelection this November. I’m leaving a safe district for councilmember at-large to represent the entire city in our fight to improve Oakland. No political posturing, pandering or excuses. I listen and act. I refuse to let Oakland’s collective opportunity be a public calamity. I respectfully ask for your vote.

6. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

Desley Brooks
Marilyn Harris
Gilda Gonzales
Kathleen Kuhner
Henry Chang, Jr.
Phillip H. Tagami
Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
Mark McClure
Jill Broadhurst
Barbara B. Schaaf
Noel Gallo
Barry Pilger
Joe L. Smith
Aracely Garza
Janet Lee Patterson
Harold R. Mayberry
Matthew Novak
Eva M. Aguillard
Yui Hay Lee
Claudia Burgos

s/IGNACIO DE LA FUENTE

OALC-5
1. That my name is: Gordon A. “Don” Link
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: City Council District 1
3. My occupation for the past five years: Electrical Contractor; Owner and Manager of Controlled Energy, A California Corporation
4. I have held the following public office: Chair, North Oakland Community Development Board; Chair, Oakland Community Policing Advisory Board; Member, Citizens Advisory Committee
5. Statement of Qualifications: I am a leader in my neighborhood, in my police beat, and in the North Oakland community. I know how crime, joblessness, school closures, and blight affect our neighborhoods and Oakland. I have been working hard for two decades to make our community a safe and vibrant place to live. While Chair of Oakland’s Community Policing Advisory Board from 1999-2008, I experienced first-hand the power of neighbors working together to improve the community. As a small businessman for more than 26 years, I know what it takes to balance a budget by increasing revenue or making cuts to respond to changing economic conditions. As your Councilmember, I will work to make our streets safe, to empower our children to be successful in school, and to assure that there are good jobs for our residents. I am committed to transforming Oakland into the vibrant community we all want.
6. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

Vance Thompson
Patrick K. McCullough
Christopher Vernon
Lawrence A. Benson
Charles Porter
Josephine Lee
Sara Somers
Floyd Huen
Susan Montauk
Walter Miles
Mattie B. Jore
John Wagers
Mary L. Hardy
Wilford B. Hardy, Sr.
Christopher Waters
Adele Schenker
Margitta Gardner
Roberta L. Klugman
Jose A. Dorado
Nicholas J. Vigliante, III

s/GORDON A. “DON” LINK
Candidate for COUNCILMEMBER, DISTRICT 1

I, CRAIG BRANDT, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Craig Brandt.
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Oakland City Council District 1
3. My occupation for the past five years has been: lawyer and parent

4. Statement of Qualifications: The first thing I want to do is hire more police officers. If our children can’t be safe walking to school or going to a movie - if we worry about our home being burglarized during the day – then the rest of life is greatly diminished. As your councilmember I will make it my core responsibility to fix the police department. I will put a stop to wasting more taxpayers’ money on a broken radio system and I will investigate why millions of dollars were spent on technology not being effectively used by the police. I am also proposing amending the current Oakland Business Tax Code to encourage new businesses to open up shop in Oakland by granting a one-time tax break. I believe in Oakland’s future. So, with your vote and some hard work, this City can be an even better place to live.

www.CraigForOakland.com

5. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

Emanuel Blackman
Barara Schultz
Peter Hollingsworth
Louise A. Kenney
Mick Kenney
Chan U Lee
Patrick Zak
Kenn Stansbury
Yaron Rosenthal
Mara Gendell
J. Kenin Keck
Alice Chen
Anne Reinsch

s/CRAIG BRANDT
Candidate for COUNCILMEMBER, DISTRICT 1

I, RICHARD RAYA, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Richard Raya
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Councilmember, District 1
3. My occupation for the past five years: Policy Director, California Forward, Budget Director, Alameda County Public Health Department

4. Statement of Qualifications: The City Hall dynamic must change. Oakland needs skilled leaders who work together to hold government accountable for reducing crime, improving our schools and growing our economy. I am the only candidate with expertise managing big budgets and a 15-year record of making government work. As the Alameda County Health Department’s budget director, I managed $120 million and 600 employees. In tough times, we saved $6 million a year without reducing vital services. Good government is critical. I know—my parents were farmworkers, I was my family’s first to go to college and earn a graduate degree. Public schools and the public safety net transformed my life. Oakland can do better, but we need leaders who work together to achieve results. I’m honored to be endorsed by environmentalists, business-owners, teachers and community leaders. They understand my pledge: Elect me and I will hold our government accountable for results. www.rayaforoakland.com

5. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

Michael Katz
Abel Guillen
Gabriel Escobar
Luis Alcazar
Tracy Virgil
Jose A. Rocha
Jorge A. Gomez
Winnie Anderson
Marisa Raya
Emily Weinstein

Michael Riemenschneider
Tom Clifford
Shannon Tracey
Ariel Biersaum
Frank Crustina
Stacey Murphy
Jonathan Fern
Marla Wilson
Valeria Velasquez
Daniel Jaeger

s/RICHARD RAYA

OKCC-3
Candidate for COUNCILMEMBER, DISTRICT 1

I, LEONARD RAPHAEL, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Leonard Raphael
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Councilmember, District 1
3. My occupation for the past five years: Certified Public Accountant
4. I have held the following public office: Treasurer of Temple Beth Abraham Board of Directors Oakland Food Pantry

5. Statement of Qualifications: Oakland residents deserve a safe, fiscally secure city with functioning parks, libraries, and roads. Laying off police and furloughing employees is not the solution. Burdening younger residents with $2.5 billion of retirement and postponed infrastructure costs is unfair. Oakland must be moved off the most violent cities list. We must replace crony-ridden violence prevention programs with effective ones. To afford 500 more police, I will push for a reduced compensation package for new city employees. Crime reduction will in turn attract more employers, increasing business taxes and jobs. To challenge the status quo, I will not accept economic support from any nonprofit or union with city contracts. I have lived in this district 35 years, studied sociology at Columbia, and earned BS and MS degrees in accounting and tax from UC Berkeley and Golden Gate University. I can lead the Council to realistic decisions to fix Oakland’s problems. www.LensForChange.com

6. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

June Chan
Karen E. Ivy
Lee R. Edwards
Edith B. Mills
Laura J. Sanchez
Greg Harland
Michael Ferro
Jim Louis Dexter
Stephanie Culhane
Mary M. McCole
Diane Isley
Brian Allen
Jennifer R. Clark
Ruby Hertz
Chia Hamilton
Elaine R. Borkon-Linssen
Loretta O’Brien
Jamal Ahmed
Aminah Shariff
Vivek Bhatia

s/LEONARD RAPHAEL
Candidate for COUNCILMEMBER, DISTRICT 1

I, AMY LEMLEY, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Amy Lemley
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Oakland City Council, District 1
3. My occupation for the past five years: Policy Director at the John Burton Foundation for Children Without Homes
4. I have held the following public office: Measure Y Violence Prevention and Public Safety Oversight Committee, Member

5. Statement of Qualifications: As a 14-year resident of Oakland, I've dedicated my personal and professional life to helping others. I've served on numerous Oakland nonprofit boards, been an active parent volunteer at Chabot Elementary and represented taxpayers on the Measure Y Oversight Committee. I founded First Place for Youth, a nonprofit that provides affordable housing to at-risk youth in Oakland. First Place has saved the public millions of dollars by preventing incarceration and promoting education. As Children's Policy Director at the John Burton Foundation, I have stopped cuts to education, prevented elderly caregivers from losing their homes and secured $50 million to build affordable housing for homeless youth. As your Councilmember, I'll build a thriving economy, reduce crime, support our schools, and maintain fire safety. I am proud to have the endorsements of Councilmembers Libby Schaaf and Pat Kernighan. I would be honored to represent you on the City Council. www.amylemleyforoakland.com

6. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

- Libby Schaaf
- Pat Kernighan
- Ken Berrick
- Earl Hamlin
- Karen Hester
- Barry Pilger
- Barbara Leslie
- Theresa Nelson
- Joanne Karchmer
- David Kessler
- Lisa Zayas Chien
- Sokhum Mao
- Beth Maher
- Kerry Hamill
- Miho Kubota
- Justin Horner
- Kerri Hurtado

s/AMY LEMLEY
Candidate for COUNCILMEMBER, DISTRICT 1

I, DAN KALB, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Dan Kalb
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Councilmember District 1
3. My occupation for the past five years: Environmental Policy Director – Union of Concerned Scientists

4. Statement of Qualifications: Together we can create good green jobs that put Oaklanders back to work and protect our environment. To make positive changes, we need leaders with experience and imagination who understand policy. I’ve spent 30 years as a successful public interest and environmental advocate, good government reformer, policy director, and community service leader for the Sierra Club, Union of Concerned Scientists, Jewish Community Relations Council, Common Cause, and other organizations. As your Councilmember, I’ll invest in job training and parolee re-entry programs—because a job is the best crime deterrent, work to make Oakland the clean tech capital of Northern California, and make our city government more accessible, responsive, and trustworthy. My commitment is to listen to your concerns, solve problems with determination and innovation, and stay true to my strong sense of integrity and community service. I value your input. View my policy proposals and contact me at www.DanKalb.net. Thanks!

5. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

Aileen Frankel
Walton E. Brown, Jr.
H.E. Christian Peeples
Judith A. Cox
Daniel J. Rush
Vien Truong
Peter Lund
Victoria Griffith
Tara Merchant Wilson
Henry Joseph Trapp

Pamela A. Drake
Aaron Lehmer
Margaret E. Cunningham
Sam Schuchat
Carla Haimowitz
Joel Fried
Christopher Dobbins
Jody A. Nunez

s/DAN KALB

OKCC-6
Candidate for COUNCILMEMBER, DISTRICT 1

I, DONALD MACLEAY, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Donald Macleay
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Oakland City Council District 1
3. My occupation for the past five years: Computer Network Engineer and Business Manager

4. Statement of Qualifications: On Council, I will address the crisis affecting Oakland youth in Education, Crime, Employment and Housing. To reduce crime in Oakland, we need to exit the revolving door prison system, work on root causes, and make a place for ex-offenders in our community. To build a city government that better serves us, we need stable money in our budget, and we must remove money and gerrymandering from our local elections with a budget and charter reform convention. I offer the skills of an educated environmentalist, an industrial worker, and a business manager. Over the 23 years that I have lived here raising my two sons, I have found that my mix of white and blue collar background connects me with many residents as does my life as a world citizen living abroad 15 years where I learned to speak French, Spanish, Italian, German and Mandarin. http://oaklandgreens.org/don/

5. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

Laura Wells
Orlando Johnson
Aaron Reaven
Joel Velasquez
Torger T. Johnson
Ralph Kanz
Laurence H. Shoup
Suzanne B. Shoup
Rashidah Grinage
Wilson Riles
Thearse Pecot
Randy Menjivar
Michael H. Rubin
Janet S. Arnold
Vicente R. Cruz, II
Michael Hutchinson
Conor Dixon
Susan Schacher
William Balderston

s/DONALD MACLEAY
Candidate for COUNCILMEMBER, DISTRICT 3

1. LARRY LIONEL YOUNG, JR., hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Larry Lionel Young, Jr.
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Councilmember, District 3
3. My occupation for the past five years: Realtor, Teacher, Consultant, Board of Director Keep Oakland Beautiful

4. Statement of Qualifications: I envision District 3 becoming the best place to live, work, and visit in the World. As a 2010 Mayoral Candidate I am running again because I am committed to making this vision, reality! Oakland’s roots need to be respected and tended to for the greater good of our city. I am humbled to have the opportunity to represent Oakland’s new generation, with roots in our wonderful city, and with concrete plans for a better future for all. I will work tirelessly and creatively to bridge the Oakland business and civic communities and to balance the budget, keep our communities safe, and provide a 21st century education to all students. I intimately understand Oakland’s unmet potential through my work as a realtor, public school teacher, youth leader, and board member of Keep Oakland Beautiful. It is time for young Oakland locals to have a seat at the table.

5. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

Arthur K. Mitchell
Joseph T. Beachman
Daniel Mark Wilson
Jason Ross
Youn Seop Chaney
Brenda Bohannon
Reggie Brown
Deborah Wysinger
Shannon Howard
Jack Yoshine

Eugene J. Campbell III
Willie Nevels
Tim Nguyen
Zachary Vasquez
Homer Black
John Williams
Noah Lopes
Andrew Stark
Vicente R. Cruz

s/LARRY LIONEL YOUNG, JR
Candidate for COUNCILMEMBER, DISTRICT 3

I, SEAN SULLIVAN, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Sean Sullivan
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Oakland City Council District 3
3. My occupation for the past five years: Youth/Education Executive/Environmental Health Advocate
4. I have held the following public office: Co-Chair, Beat 7 Neighborhood Crime Prevention Council; Vice Chair, Oakland Community Action Partnership Board; Member, Oakland District 3 Development Block Grant Committee; Member, Federal Management Agency/Alameda County Emergency Food and Shelter Program Board; Commissioner, Alameda County Human Relations Commission.
5. Statement of Qualifications: Tired of the lack of attention from City Hall? Me, too! Accountable, proven leadership will make our streets safer, employ our youth, create jobs and provide the services (parking, pothole repair, street lighting, graffiti/dumping removal) we demand. As your Councilmember, I’ll continue the fight to have the attention and resources from City Hall we deserve. With your help, I helped establish a new Youth Center providing innovative job training programs for our young people; secured thousands of dollars in funding for our District’s community organizations; planted countless trees and cleaned filthy streets; and worked to make our neighborhoods safer, cleaner, and healthier. My priorities are: Public Safety—add Police Patrols/street lighting, eliminate graffiti and dumping; Jobs—expand job training for youth and employment retraining for Oakland residents; Obtain our Fair Share of Services—maintain and improve parks, fix potholes, add parking support our small businesses. Join me: SeanSullivan.org
6. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

Pat Kernighan  Max Allstadt
Elsa Ortiz  Janet Lee Patterson
Kathy Neal  Barbara Schaaf
Viola Gonzales  Friederike Droegmueller
Henry Chang, (ret.)  Elise Ackerman
Gilda Gonzales  Christina Ramos
Michael Colbruno  Melissa Rosengard
Phil Tagami  Jeremy Crandell
Susan Sawyer Smith  Jill Broadhurst
Marilyn Harris  Robert Apodaca

s/SEAN SULLIVAN
Candidate for COUNCILMEMBER, DISTRICT 3

I, DERRICK MUHAMMAD, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Derrick Muhammad
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Councilmember, District 3
3. My occupation for the past five years: Longshoreman

4. Statement of Qualifications: My brother was murdered in Oakland. His death encouraged me to fight for our City. I'm running because I have the know-how, skills, and commitment to bring about the change needed in District 3. As a native, I understand the needs of Oakland. I serve on the Citizens Police Review Board, where I use my legal training and negotiation skills to deliberate cases. I volunteer for the California Congress of Seniors, where I have organized financial literacy workshops to protect seniors. As a Longshoreman at the Port, I will push for a better relationship between the City and Port to ensure residents get their fair share of jobs and contracting opportunities. I will fight to enhance the quality of life for all District 3 residents. Please join Councilmember Desley Brooks, Peralta Trustee Abel Guillen, and the Honorable Rob Bonta, and vote for me on November 6.

5. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

Harold R. Mayberry
Mark Alexander
Margaret Gordon
Frank Tucker
Desley Brooks
Christopher Dobbins
Alice A. Spearman
Kenneth Houston
Rashidah Grinage
Carol A. Westbrooks Curtis
Melanie M. Shelby
Aracely Garza
David Glover
Norman McLeod
Cleophas S. Williams
Jadari J. Herbert
Jumoke Hinton Hodge
Jeff A. Crear
Bobbie Bond
April Rasheed

s/DERRICK MUHAMMAD

OKCC3-3
Candidate for COUNCILMEMBER, DISTRICT 3

I, NYEISHA DEWITT, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Nyeisha DeWitt
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Councilmember, District 3
3. My occupation for the past five years: Non-profit Executive

4. Statement of Qualifications: I grew up in this wonderful city - I’m running to help Oakland live up to its promise. I have the right combination of community awareness and leadership experience to serve effectively. I’ve advocated for local hire and good paying jobs, delivered over 7500 backpacks and supplies to students at Oakland’s largest back-to-school celebration and worked on public oversight committees to ensure taxpayer’s dollars are spent wisely. Most importantly, I understand the issues facing our diverse community and how they often compete with one another. I’m an example of such a dichotomy; I’m a high school dropout who earned a doctoral degree in Organization and Leadership. I’m an artist and academic. I’m a community organizer and small business owner. I’m a mother and an executive. We need representatives who know the challenges and has a track record of solving them. If you agree, vote Nyeisha Dewitt for City Council. www.dewittforoakland.com

5. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

Jaime A. Williams
Marlon McWilson
Chantal Reynolds
Mario Juarez
Letitia Henderson
Andrea Herbert
Laniece Jones
Geoffrey Pete
C. Dennis Edwards II
Henry Hitz

Kimberly L. Mayfield
Shon Buford
Julie Waters
Ali Ar Rasheed

s/NYEISHA DEWITT
Candidate for COUNCILMEMBER, DISTRICT 3

I, LYNETTE GIBSON MCELHANEY, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Lynette Gibson McElhaney
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Councilmember, District 3
3. My occupation for the past five years: Chief Executive Officer of Neighborhood Housing Services of the East Bay

4. Statement of Qualifications: Oakland’s needs are ignored while city leaders bicker. From West Oakland to the Uptown, from Adams Point/Lake Merritt to Jack London, Oaklanders want a government that makes sense. I will focus on what matters: reduce crime, strengthen our schools, improve community health and grow Oakland’s economy to create jobs. As CEO of a multi-million dollar housing and economic development nonprofit, I care about results. I know how to balance budgets, make payroll and bridge the interests of business with neighborhood needs. I believe that a healthy city balances a vibrant business sector with a commitment to economic justice. After graduating from UC Berkeley, my husband and I made our home in West Oakland. My son attends public school here. We worship, shop and dine here. We proudly call Oakland home. I’m honored to be endorsed by teachers, firefighters, pastors and small business owners. I’d appreciate your vote. www.LynetteMcElhaney.com

5. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

R. Zachary Wasserman  Brigitte Cook
C.J. Hirschfield  Timothy W. James
Daniel Boggan  Georgia Webb
Merlin Edwards  Ralph Devers
Winnie Anderson  Lauran Cherry
Clarence McElhaney Jr.  Asha Reed
Zachary Carey  Dale Ingram III
Richard Raya  Stephanie Smith
Tom Clifford  
Casey Farmer  

s/LYNETTE GIBSON MCELHANEY
Candidate for COUNCILMEMBER, DISTRICT 3

I, ALEX MILLER-COLE, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Alex Miller-Cole
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Councilmember, District 3
3. My occupation for the past five years: Interior designer, Community Advocate, Junior developer.
4. I have held the following public office: Community Policing Advisory Board Commissioner
5. Statement of Qualifications: My years of on-the-ground community work has taught me that social justice and economic development are two sides of the same coin. My record has demonstrated that together we can address crime, create jobs, and revitalize neighborhoods -- without new taxes. During the last 16 years, I’ve led a community effort to create safety in neighborhoods where there was no hope. We brought job opportunities to those who needed them most. Now, we need new leadership to deliver responsible, sustainable and fair solutions to our challenges. District 3 drives Oakland’s future. We have multi-billion dollar projects underway that can generate good-paying jobs for our residents. We’re rich with opportunity – we’re the region’s transportation hub, and lead the local arts and environmental justice movements. The next four years will be critical to ensuring our future. I offer you my vision, business expertise, tireless work ethic, and unwavering love for Oakland.
6. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:
   Christina Castaneda – Hull
   Stephen Long
   Brian Beveridge
   Margaret Gordon
   David Raymond Kidd
   Michael Riemenschneider
   Nathan D. Hills
   Tony P. Hamilton, Sr.
   Christopher Miller-Cole
   Christopher Alorgi
   Brenda J. Hyde
   Janice Stamos
   James B. Lester, III
   Brian Hicks
   Carol Wyatt
   Brian Steele
   Amy Dryden
   Ann Katz
   Deborah Rose

s/ALEX MILLER-COLE
Candidate for COUNCILMEMBER, DISTRICT 5

I, DAWN KRISTEN McMahan, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Dawn Kristen McMahan
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: City Council District 5
3. My occupation for the past five years: Executive Artistic Director Pythia Arts Foundation; Waitress Max’s Opera Café; Director/Founder Phoenix Rising Homeless Project; Director, Oak Tree Arts

4. Statement of Qualifications: I am bringing needed skills and experience to our City Council, and my district. I am the Executive Artistic Director of the Pythia Arts Foundation, and the creator of community development programs: the Phoenix Rising Homeless Project, and the Oak Tree Arts Center in East Oakland. Through my creative work, I have excelled at manifesting large projects on very small budgets, through galvanizing community support. By working with the underserved since 2005, I am trained and experienced in conflict resolution, crisis intervention, substance abuse issues, trauma recovery, and the needs of youth and underserved families. I attended the Merritt College Community Social Services/Substance Abuse Counseling Program, and I earned my Bachelor’s degree at the University of Southern California in 1992. As the daughter of a neurobiologist and an elementary school teacher in East Palo Alto, I have chosen a life of service for my community that embraces innovation.

5. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

Sean Coutts
Claudia Moreno
Leslie Richer
Yasser Alshoja
Arturo Delgado
Kenneth Gulley
Steven M. Solomon
Matthew A. Beck
Marie E. MacGinnis Dawkins
Robert Dawkins

Katja Geldhof
Miles Jacko
Richard Harvey, Sr.
Frederick D. Perry
Miranda Maruri
Alisha R. Jones
James Kehl
Alex Mendez

s/DAWN KRISTEN McMahan

OKCC5-1
Candidate for COUNCILMEMBER, DISTRICT 5

1. MARIO JUAREZ, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

   1. That my name is: Mario Juarez
   2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Councilmember, District 5
   3. My occupation for the past five years: Small Business Owner at Mario Juarez Real Estate
   4. I have held the following public office: Alameda County Democratic Central Committee, 16th District

5. Statement of Qualifications: Old time politicians aren’t getting Oakland back on track. We need a new generation of community-based leaders with fresh ideas and energy to solve our problems. I built a successful local business, created good local jobs, employed hundreds of Oaklanders, and on the Sierra Club Board. My business has helped revitalize major portions of this District, bringing new businesses and jobs. My plan: improve community policing with officers who are actually from Oakland, expand job training programs, establish a services center to assist, not criminalize troubled youth and a special homeownership program for local teachers and public employees. I’ll put my proven job creating abilities and innovative ideas to work for you. My vision: an Oakland we’re proud to call home. I’m a proven, compassionate, community-oriented small businessperson. I pledge to be principled and open as your Councilperson. I’ll work with everyone to get results for District 5. wwwMario2012.com

6. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

   Alfonso E Loera-Rubalcava
   Alton Jelks
   Betty Olson-Jones
   Dan Rush
   H.E. Christian Peoples
   James V. Matthews II
   James Williams
   Jose Arredondo
   Kathy Neal
   Linda Handy
   Marlon L. McWilson
   Michael Colbruno
   Nate Miley
   Pamela A. Drake
   Rebecca Kaplan
   Robert Raburn
   Toni R Cook
   William B. Patterson
   William S. Riles
   Zenophon Abraham

s/MARIO JUAREZ
Candidate for COUNCILMEMBER, DISTRICT 5

I, ARACELY GARZA, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Aracely “Shelly” Garza
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Councilmember, District 5
3. My occupation for the past five years: General Manager – Rising Sun Enterprises, City of Oakland Executive Assistant

4. Statement of Qualifications: My Name is Aracely “Shelly” Garza. I am running for city council because I believe in the citizens of Oakland and their ability to create change. As an Executive Assistant to a former City Council member, City Administrators and Economic Development Agency Director; I have watched, listened and learned from the residents and leaders of Oakland. I want to continue taking an active role in the improvement of District 5 and the City of Oakland. Under my 4 year leadership as a small business owner I have helped establish over 100 new businesses, providing a fountain of employment and revenue to the city of Oakland. I bring 16 years of management experience within the private and public sectors. I believe that together we can be the solution; we can establish safer streets, economic vitality and better quality of life. I would appreciate your vote for me; Aracely “Shelly” Garza.

5. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

Desley Brooks
Ignacio De La Fuente
Gerald A. Simon
Yahya Shabazz
Emilia Ortero
Jeffery P. Williams
Michael A. Munson
Ken Houston
Martha Y. Toscano – Perez
Susan S. Smith

Derrick H. Muhammad
Rachel Townsend
Claudia Burgos
Rogdio Silver-Toscano
Kazandra Garza

s/ARACELY GARZA
Candidate for COUNCILMEMBER, DISTRICT 5

I, NOEL GALLO, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Noel Gallo
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Councilmember, District 5
3. My occupation for the past five years: Regional Director, Ray and Associates National Superintendent/Executive Search for US School Districts
4. I have held the following public office: Oakland Board of Education; Board President, Chairperson of Facilities Committee, Member of Oakland Athletic League Commission, Audit Committee, and Student Safety Committee; Regional Delegate, California School Boards Association
5. Statement of Qualifications: For the past twenty years, I have dedicated my life to improving educational opportunities for Oakland. I have led efforts to renovate and build new schools, restore fiscal accountability, and support classroom instruction that produces top-performing schools. Experienced leadership has never been more critical to Oakland’s future. I have a proven track record of public service along with the experience and work ethic to get things done. My priorities are to reduce crime and create new jobs. Each neighborhood deserves to be attractive, viable and safe. I will attract new businesses and work with existing businesses to hire Oakland residents. I support increasing the number of police officers, curfews, and zero tolerance for graffiti and illegal dumping. I am a lifelong resident of Oakland. I am proud to have raised four children who attended local schools and universities and continue to live and work in Oakland.
6. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

   Ignacio De La Fuente
   Claudia Burgos
   Preston J. Turner
   Abraham Ruelas
   Maria L. Sanchez
   Henry Woods
   Alan S. Yee
   Jose A. Dorado
   Jennifer Rakowski
   David Kakashiba
   
   Christopher Dobbins
   Alice Spearman
   Romeo Garcia
   Aliza Gallo
   Lisa Jennings Young
   Mario Bobino
   Mónica Tell
   Patricia Kernighan
   Wortham Fears

   s/NOEL GALLO
Candidate for COUNCILMEMBER, DISTRICT 7

I, LARRY E. REID, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Larry E. Reid
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Oakland City Council, District 7
3. My occupation for the past five years: Oakland City Councilmember, District 7
4. I have held the following public office: Oakland City Councilmember, District 7

5. Statement of Qualifications: I’ve worked hard for our district, but I haven’t worked alone. When I first stood up to represent our district, I asked that the community join me, so that we could make real changes. Through this partnership, we have made significant changes in our district that will continue to add to our job base, secure our community, and improve the quality of life. Working together, we have accumulated additional resources for community improvements, which exceed all other City Council Districts in Oakland. We have fulfilled a commitment to families who live in our community, who will continue to benefit from the new local economic changes that we have created, and the renewal of our neighborhoods. I’m proud of what we’ve accomplished, and pleased to have the support of law enforcement; faith based leadership, educators, firefighters, the business community, youth and senior providers and, most importantly, families throughout our district.

6. The signatures of not more than twenty not less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

   David Kiteley
   Gladys Green
   Fred Franklin
   Olis Simmons
   Gloria Jeffery
   Bob Jackson
   Leon McDaniels
   George Fullwood
   Joe L. Smith
   Alice Spearman

   s/LARRY E. REID

OKCC7-1
Candidate for COUNCILMEMBER, DISTRICT 7

I, SHERYL WALTON, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Sheryl Walton
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Oakland City Council, District 7
3. My occupation for the past five years: Community based participatory research consultant with Pangea Global AIDS Foundation/Trainer for TimeBank USA
4. I have held the following public office: Central City East Project Area Committee, District 7

5. Statement of Qualifications: Born and raised in East Oakland’s District 7, I raised my son here as a single parent. As a community health expert with 25 years’ experience, I helped create successful health, education, economic development and crime prevention programs in Oakland and statewide. For 8 years I served on the Central City East Project Area Committee which resulted in redeveloping the MacArthur Blvd. corridor and Foothill Square projects. I helped secure $3,000,000 for the Madison School Based Health Clinic and my community capacity building model was key in Oakland’s anti-violence City-County Neighborhood Initiative. I earned my B.A. in child development from Mills College and my Master’s in Public Health from UC Berkeley. My priorities as Councilmember are to: Make our streets safe, create jobs and job training, and help our teachers and schools educate our children. We need a strong advocate from the community who will put our neighborhoods first. Walton2012.org

6. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

James E. Vann
Jose A. Dorado
Norman W. McLeod
Edward W. Yu
Ramona Preciado
Margaret Cunningham
Pamela A. Drake
Harriet Wright
Vicki Alexander
Melanie Tervalon

Anna Maureen Cronin
Angie Tam
Marilyn Lawson

s/SHERYL WALTON

OKCC7-2
Candidate for COUNCILMEMBER, DISTRICT 7

1. BEVERLY A. WILLIAMS, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Beverly A. Williams
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: City Council District 7
3. My occupation for the past five years has been: Administrative Assistant
4. I currently hold the position of: Commissioner Vice-Chair of the Housing, Residential Rent and Relocation Board (Oakland Rent Board)

5. Statement of Qualifications: I am Beverly A. Williams a native of Oakland and live in District 7. A graduate of OUSD receiving a BA Degree in Public Administration from Golden Gate University. My background is Personnel Administration. I am Commissioner Vice-Chair on the Oakland Rent Board and Vice-Chair of NCPC in my beat. I am a strong community Advocate for ACCE who campaign/lobby for change and when needed work with other organizations (e.g. OCO, Urban Habitat, EBHO, SEIU Local 1021, Urban Strategies, EBASE etc.) We have been extremely successful working with Community Economic Development on the Vacancy Property Ordinance rendering 1.6+ million dollars in fines over the past year. Emphasis is on Jobs and job creation; Foreclosures and Blight; Public Health and Safety; and Community and Economic Development for a sustainable community which includes after school programs, face lifting the appearance of our community, and Responsible Banking in the City of Oakland.

6. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

   Tanya Dennis          Arinda J. Befort
   Portia Ridgeway       Sara A. Johnson
   Geneva Ellison        Zora L. Hill
   Brenda Cole           Ginene A Mills
   Gwen Wiggins          
   Lynette Neidhardt     
   Tammy McGraw          
   Michael McGraw        
   Lakiethia McGraw      
   Elnora Williams

   s/BEVERLY A. WILLIAMS

OKCC7-3
Candidate for CITY ATTORNEY

I, JANE BRUNNER, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Jane Brunner
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: City Attorney
3. My occupation for the past five years: Attorney/City Councilmember
4. I have held the following public office: Oakland City Councilmember, Association of Bay Area Governments, Joint Policy Committee

5. Statement of Qualifications: I have two decades of accomplishments for Oakland as community leader and Councilmember, focusing on job creation, environmental issues, and neighborhood improvement. I’ve practiced law for 25 years, specializing in labor issues and civil rights. The City Attorney’s Office spent $32 million last year. What did Oakland residents get? Very little. The City Attorney’s Office settles lawsuits that should be fought and loses lawsuits that should be won. With 70 employees, including 35 attorneys, this is one of Oakland’s largest and most mismanaged departments. The City Attorney’s Office needs new leadership. I will work with community groups, local businesses, and residents to fight for Oakland taxpayers, reduce waste, and eliminate corruption. I’m running to make the City Attorney’s Office a source of innovation, honesty, and part of the solution to Oakland’s chronic budgetary problems. I’m endorsed by Assemblymember Sandré Swanson, Oakland Police Officers, and Oakland Firefighters. For more information – www.janebrunner.com.

6. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

Desley Brooks
Henry Chang, Jr.
Jody London
Andreas Clover
Ronile Lahti
Marjory Gibson Haskell
Arabella Martinez
Phillip H. Tagami
Charles Porter
Daniel Robertson
Victor K. Uno
A.Z. Christian Peeples
Ersie M. Joyner, III
Shirley Burnell
Alan Dones
Monica Barra-Gibson
Glen William Jarvis
Keith Carson
Yui Hay Lee
Harold R. Mayberry

s/JANE BRUNNER
Candidate for CITY ATTORNEY

I, BARBARA JEAN PARKER, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Barbara Jean Parker
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: City Attorney
3. My occupation for the past five years: City Attorney and Chief Assistant City Attorney
4. I have held the following public office: City Attorney

5. Statement of Qualifications: Our City Attorney must have the experience and integrity to fight for Oakland. My legal career spans 35 years. I graduated from Harvard Law, served as an Assistant U.S. Attorney and member of the State Judicial Council, overseeing California’s courts. I’ve served 21 years in the City Attorney’s Office, including 10 years as Chief Assistant City Attorney and as City Attorney since 2011. As City Attorney, I’m keeping politics and corruption out of City government. I’m protecting taxpayer dollars, and doing more with less: outside attorney costs are down nearly 40% and settlement costs almost 50% since I took office. I’ve shut down hotels that were centers for child prostitution. I’m creating reforms to get guns off our streets, ensuring women safe access to reproductive health clinics, and fighting Wall Street banks and foreclosures. I will continue serving all Oaklanders with the highest degree of integrity, independence, and professionalism. www.CityAttorneyParker.com

6. The signatures of not more than twenty not less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

Keith Carson
Judy Cox
George Cummings
Pamela Drake
Charley Hames, Jr.
Robert Harris
George Holland
Corinne Jan,
Rebecca Kaplan
David Kakishiba
Patricia Kernighan
Mary King
Dale Minami
Victor Ochoa
Eva Paterson
William Patterson
Geoffrey Pete
John Protopappas
Larry Reid
Libby Schaaf

s/BARBARA JEAN PARKER
Candidate for SCHOOL BOARD DIRECTOR, DISTRICT 1

I, JODY S. LONDON, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Jody Susan London
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Director, Oakland Unified School District 1
3. My occupation for the past five years has been: consultant/businesswoman
4. I have held the following public office: Director, Oakland Unified School District

5. Statement of Qualifications: Since I joined the School Board in 2009, Oakland Unified has returned to local control. As the parent of two Oakland public school students, I'm proud that we have closed the $40 million structural deficit that put us in receivership. We've implemented a Strategic Plan that ensures every student has social and emotional support to succeed in the classroom. We've adopted the A-G graduation criteria as required by the University of California and California State University systems. Our construction program is building green schools and has implemented 15 school-based health clinics to help keep students healthy and in the classroom. I've worked at senior levels in government and the private sector, and in leadership positions with non-profit groups including Chairperson of Save the Bay. With your vote, we will continue to improve our schools and communities. BA, UC Berkeley; Master of Public Administration, Columbia University. www.votejody.com

6. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

Kenneth Rice
Janet Lynn Cohn
Jean Parker
Christopher Vernon
Susan Piper
Leslie Olrich
Gary Yee
Juanita Matthews
Valerie Randall Winemiller
Phillipa Barron

Karin Foust
Michael N. Aronson
Jane Brunner
Paul Kagiwada
Myra Cummiskey
Kerry Hamill
Michael Allison

s/JODY S. LONDON

OKSC1-1
Candidate for SCHOOL BOARD DIRECTOR, DISTRICT 1

I, THEARSE PECOT, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Thearse Pecot
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Director, Oakland Unified School District 1
3. My occupation for the past five years has been: Parent conscientiously responding
4. I have held the following public office: Director, Oakland Unified School District
5. Statement of Qualifications: I was born and raised in Oakland, and educated in Oakland public schools. I am committed to every child receiving what they are entitled to: an equal quality public education. I took the lead in organizing parents, teachers and community members to stop the closure of Santa Fe Elementary School in District 1. The current Board’s decision left nearly half of District 1 without a public elementary school. I’ve passionately fought school closures city-wide. I stand for fully funded public education for all by reducing class size, ending school closures, increasing District 1 attendance, and increasing graduation rates district-wide. I support our educator’s union. For 30 years the state has entrusted me to act on behalf of children and adults with disabilities. I would like to act on your behalf. To successfully run the world tomorrow, we must educate our students today. I ask for your vote November 6th.
6. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

Rahman Muhammad  George Holland
Donald Macleay    Katherine A. Burrell
Michael H. Rubin  Joel Velasquez
Laura Wells       Richard Strong
Harriet C. Hutchinson
Ronald Freeman Victoria Stith
William B. Patterson
Marzellia Miller
Diane L. Johnson
Bill Balderston

s/ THEARSE PECOT
Candidate for SCHOOL BOARD DIRECTOR, DISTRICT 3

I, BENJAMIN LANG, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Benjamin Lang
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Oakland School Board District 3
3. My occupation for the past five years: Public School Educator

4. Statement of Qualifications: I will bring real world experience and knowledge of what works in public education to the Oakland School Board. During my twenty-plus years as a classroom teacher and administrator, I never lost sight of what mattered most—helping our teachers teach and our children learn. I consider myself fortunate to be around at a time when so many exciting Internet and mobile technologies have the potential to improve instruction and enhance learning. My background puts me in a position to ensure that Oakland Schools leverages these technologies to the fullest. If you elect me to represent you on the Oakland School Board, I will focus on bringing 21st Century teaching tools and methodologies to Oakland classrooms and sound fiscal practices to the administrative offices.

5. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

Rita Manachi  Mary Kathleen Welter  Elise Ackerman  Nathan Davies  Barton Mayhew  Michael Bruce Roman  Aixia Maria Gannon  John A. Creaser  Sarah Jean Harper  Amey B. Shaw

Marjie Chaset  Bridget Davies

s/BENJAMIN LANG
Candidate for SCHOOL BOARD DIRECTOR, DISTRICT 3

I, JUMOKE HINTON HODGE, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Jumoke Hinton Hodge
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Oakland Unified School District Board
4. I have held the following public office: Oakland Unified School District Director, District 3

5. Statement of Qualifications: I’m running for re-election to continue working to build public schools that fully serve our youth, families, and community. During my term, we have made tough decisions that have brought Oakland Unified School District out of state control; today, I am proud that we are most improved urban school district in California. We have written a bold Strategic Plan for the District, created Oakland’s first “STEM” learning corridor, required that every student take college and career coursework, and taken action to address the epidemic of failing and truant young black males. Going forward, we must ensure these policies and others are implemented fairly and equitably, and that limited resources are spent wisely. As a mother and parent advocate with 25 years of experience in education, I am best prepared to take on that responsibility for another term. Join Councilmember Nancy Nadel and other community leaders – vote Hinton Hodge for School Board! www.hintonhodgeforoakland.com.

6. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

Nancy Nadel
Gay Plair Cobb
Raymond Lankford
Linda Handy
Mary V. King
Brandon Sturdivant Sr.
Henry Hitz
Kitty Kelley Epstein
Kenna Stormogipson
Bernida Reagan

Lougbemiga Oluwole, Sr.
Barbara Lafitte-Oluwole
Trina Barton
Ray Kidd
LaNiece Jones
David N. Roach
Phyllis K. Hall
Latronda Lumpkins
Imani Hinton Lott

s/JUMOKE HINTON HODGE
Candidate for SCHOOL BOARD DIRECTOR, DISTRICT 3

I, RICHARD FUENTES, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Richard Fuentes
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Oakland School Board, District 3
3. My occupation for the past five years: Educator/Legislative Director

4. Statement of Qualifications: Our children deserve a clean environment and quality education, and teachers need the resources to prepare our youth for success in today’s global economy. Growing up I experienced poverty, violence, and failing schools firsthand – very similar to conditions in Oakland District 3 schools – and as a result I couldn’t read or write English until 5th grade. This experience made me an advocate for youth and education. I will not sit back and watch Oakland youth be held back or fall behind. I’ll work to rebuild Oakland’s schools through partnerships with parents, teachers, administrators, and neighborhoods. I’m a proven community leader with budgeting expertise. As Hoover Elementary School Site Council President, I spearheaded initiatives that transformed Hoover Elementary into the most improved West Oakland elementary school. I will get the same results for students and parents in my community as your representative on the School Board. Thank you for your vote. www.RichardFuentes.com

5. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

Laurence E. Reid                         Marilyn Harris
Patricia Kernighan                      Barbara Schaaf
Henry Chang                            Janet Paterson
Alice Spearman                        Richelle Lieberman
Elsa Ortiz                             Amana Harris
Kathy Neal                             Iris Winograd
Gilda Gonzales                       Ronald Muhammad
Phil Tagami                            Susan Sawyer Smith
Carletta L. Starks                     Darrel Carey
Christina Ramos                      Friederike Droegemuller

s/RICHARD FUENTES

OKSB3-3
Candidate for SCHOOL BOARD DIRECTOR, DISTRICT 5

I, MICHAEL HUTCHINSON, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Michael Hutchinson
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: School Board, District 5
3. My occupation for the past five years: Educator
4. Statement of Qualifications: I am proud to say I was born, raised, and educated in Oakland. I attended Crocker Highlands Elementary, McChesney Jr. High, Oakland High, and Skyline High Schools before going on to UC Berkeley. I have worked and volunteered in Oakland's public schools and with Oakland's youth for the past twenty years. I have a passion for the education and betterment of Oakland's youth and I highly value the role public education plays in individual lives and healthy communities. I am deeply concerned about the state of public education in Oakland. We have a chance, with November's elections, to chart a new course for our school district. I will work to end school closures, increase enrollment, facilitate community engagement and reprioritize the budget. I strongly believe that every child has the right to a high quality public education. Vote Mike Hutchinson for quality, public, neighborhood schools.
5. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

Daniel Hutchinson
Angelica Jongco
Joel Velasquez
Harriet C. Hutchinson
Linda P. Moore
Robert A. Rooke
Pamela A. Drake
Julie Rowell
Tom Stone
Sheryl Neely
William G. Neely
Lori Robbins
Megan Chen
Darrin Porter
Kirsten Berzon
Amy Dunn-Ruiz
Jeremy Bramson
Omar Konin

s/MICHAEL HUTCHINSON
Candidate for SCHOOL BOARD DIRECTOR, DISTRICT 5

I, ROSIE TORRES, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Rosie Torres
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: School Board District 5
3. My occupation for the past five years: Attorney at Torres Law Group

4. Statement of Qualifications: Public schools can change lives and transform communities. This is what inspires me to run for Oakland School Board. As a parent, children’s advocate, school volunteer, attorney, business owner, career mentor, community fundraiser and public school graduate, I will bring valuable experience to move our schools forward. I am ready for the challenge even in these tough economic times for families, schools, and communities in Oakland. My goals are simple: Put kids FIRST. Provide every child with a safe, supportive learning environment. Protect classroom funding—especially quality teachers and small class sizes. Promote 21st Century learning experience, including the technologies students need for college and career success. Challenge conventional wisdom with innovation and practical budget solutions. Foster an OUSD culture that’s transparent, responsive and accountable. I have earned widespread District 5 support. Help me protect our local quality public education. Elect Rosie Torres. Thank you. www.rosieforoaklandschools.com

5. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:
   Jose Dorado
   Esteban Duenas
   Noel Gallo
   Richard Johnson
   Kathy Vaquilar
   Barbara Miller
   Giana Gallo
   Annabelle Flores
   Mary Miles
   Paul Wolf

   Emily Goldenberg

   s/ROSIE TORRES
Candidate for SCHOOL BOARD DIRECTOR, DISTRICT 7

I, JAMES HARRIS, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: James Harris
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Oakland School Board Director, District 7
3. My occupation for the past five years: Creative Director, Morgan Media Group

4. Statement of Qualifications: As an East Oakland native, a former teacher, and a parent of two, I believe that building strong public schools is the key to breaking the cycle of unemployment and violence that plagues our community. Every day in Oakland, we’re losing more and more of our kids. We cannot afford politicians who are more interested in fighting yesterday’s battles than solving today’s problems. I’m running for School Board to bring new leadership to our District that focuses on nothing but preparing our kids for success in college, career, and citizenship. When elected, some of my priorities will be: 1) reducing class sizes, 2) lowering dropout and absentee rates, 3) encouraging parent and community involvement, 4) ensuring schools are safe, clean, and have updated technology, and 5) increasing resources for underperforming Black and Latino students. I respectfully ask for your vote. For more information – including a complete endorsement list – visit www.harrisforeastoakland.com.

5. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

   Aryn Bowman
   Christina Villareal
   Elnora T. Webb
   Colette McPherson
   Mary Prime-Lawrence
   E.M. Lewis
   Norris Shepard
   Doreen Anthony
   Benjamin Achtenberg
   Addisu Demissie

   Valerie Coleman Morris
   Ciara Coleman

s/JAMES HARRIS
Candidate for SCHOOL BOARD DIRECTOR, DISTRICT 7

I, ALICE SPEARMAN, hereby declare that I am a candidate for an elective office in the City of Oakland, and make the following statement, to-wit:

1. That my name is: Alice Spearman
2. The office for which I am a candidate is: Oakland School Board Director, District 7
3. My occupation for the past five years: School Board Director, District 7
4. I have held the following public office: School Board Director, District 7

5. Statement of Qualifications: My name is Alice Adrienne Spearman mother of two adult daughters, both who graduated from Castlemont Senior High and grandmother of two young ladies who both attending Castlemont presently. I am also a graduate of Castlemont Senior High School and a lifelong resident of Oakland. I've attended California University Eastbay and California University at San Jose. I have represented District 7 since 2005. I have previously served as Vice President of the Board for 3 years and elected President of the Board of Education in 2009. I created a Local utilization Vendor Policy which guaranteed utilization of Local Businesses/Small Businesses, and hiring of Oakland Residents on all construction sites in Oakland Unified. I ensured the return of Castlemont to a single full service school and ensured the formation of a "Promise Neighborhood" in Sobrante Park making a K-12 Educational Opportunity. Moving Oakland Forward.

6. The signatures of not more than twenty nor less than ten residents of the City of Oakland sponsoring my candidacy are as follows:

Dorothy J. Agee
Clarence A. Boyd
Dorothy King
Marlon L. McWilson
Ronald Muhammad
Noel Gallo
Zachary E. Carey
Christopher Dobbins
Margaret Gordon
Rebecca Kaplan

Cari McCane
Gwen McCane
Desley Brooks
Phelbia Richardson
Gladys Green
Ken Houston
Larry E. Reid
Richard Fuentes
Kathy Neal
Harold R. Mayberry

s/ALICE SPEARMAN
Candidates’ Statements
CITY OF PLEASANTON
Mayor

CHERYL COOK-KALLIO
Occupation: Councilmember, Civics Teacher
My education and qualifications are: Twenty-five years ago I chose to raise my family in Pleasanton because it was a safe, vibrant city with excellent schools and a strong sense of community. Pleasanton retains these outstanding qualities. Your vote will determine who will lead Pleasanton, and more importantly, which direction our beloved city will take and how it will grow. It is about issues and effectiveness, and the ability to get the job done. Six years as your City Councilmember, including three terms as Vice Mayor have given me the practical experience needed to serve as Mayor. Teaching Advanced Placement Government, U.S. History and Economics has provided a philosophical perspective of how and why our government works. As Mayor I will focus on the critical issues that impact our quality of life: public safety, completing State Route 84, traffic signalization, economic growth and development, and affordable housing. Ensuring Pleasanton remains a vibrant, economically viable community by creating jobs and housing opportunities while strengthening our business districts and promoting ethical and accountable City Government. I am accessible and inclusive, and will provide the strong, pro-active leadership required to lead Pleasanton into the future. I would be honored to have your vote. To learn more visit www.VoteCook-Kallio.com

JERRY THORNE
Occupation: Councilmember/Retired Professional Engineer
My education and qualifications are: It has been my honor to serve as your City Councilmember and three-term Vice-Mayor. We have accomplished much together and we must continue to focus on the future to improve and retain the great quality of life of our City. Preserving the high standards of our schools and maintaining a safe environment for our children, financial security realized through long-term pension reforms, sensible land use planning, and traffic mitigation will be extremely important issues for residents in the coming years. I am actively exploring solutions to these challenges. We must consider creative ways to fund the completion of Bernal Community Park and the connection from El Charro Road to Stanley Boulevard. We’ll also continue to streamline the permitting process critical to attracting and retaining great businesses. They generate jobs and provide revenue to support our many amenities such as the Firehouse Arts Center, our wonderful parks, and a wide range of youth programs. Results-oriented leadership has been the key to my success in both the public and private sectors. I am committed to fighting for Pleasanton’s fair share at all levels of government. Please visit my website at www.jerrythorne.com. Keep Pleasanton great: Elect Jerry Thorne
MIKE HARRIS
Occupation: Software Architect
Age: 40
My education and qualifications are: I am a proud and grateful resident of the City of Pleasanton for over 13 years. However, I'm alarmed by the changes that are taking place within our city and concerned with the future landscape of the challenges Pleasanton will be faced with. I am therefore inclined to serve the community for the first time and will do so by adhering to principles and common sense. I respect our valiant Police and Firemen and intend to divert hardships on their families by resolving the City of Pleasanton's growing unfunded liabilities with fair and reasonable negotiation. I will encourage new businesses and the jobs they create by reducing and preventing restrictive regulations which ultimately drive businesses elsewhere in the valley. The City of Pleasanton and its elected officials should plan the growth and development rate appropriate for our city. It should not be subverted by appointed regional councils and committees. Pleasanton must preserve its sovereignty and ability to operate within its means without imposing new taxes. Please support and cast your vote for me and together we'll protect the Pleasanton we cherish.

ERLENE DEMARCUS
Occupation: Transportation Consultant
My education and qualifications are: Erlene DeMarcus is a recognized transportation expert who has spent a career working for the betterment of our community. She is running for Council to continue those efforts, concentrating on quality of life issues like transportation, jobs, public safety, and children's programs. Erlene brought BART to Pleasanton. She worked with neighborhoods to forge a community consensus supporting the extension, led the successful Measure B campaign, then as BART Director insured ours was the first extension built. A former Congressional staffer and consultant to County Supervisors, Erlene will fight cut-through traffic and complete BART to Livermore, freeing up parking and taking out-of-town cars off our streets. Erlene is committed to bringing quality jobs to Pleasanton, and retaining the ones we have here already, bringing more shopping choices, and more dollars for public safety. The opportunity to work closer to where we live turns commute time into family time; our children have more options to stay close as they enter the workforce, and our community’s quality of life benefits. Please join with teachers, firefighters, environmentalists, small business owners, community leaders and many of your friends and neighbors in supporting Erlene DeMarcus for City Council. www.DemarcusForCouncil.com

KARLA BROWN
Occupation: Pleasanton Business Woman
Age: 55
My education and qualifications are: I am an advocate for “Slow and Smart Growth” policies, which are needed to preserve our small-town character. Future development should be gradual and well planned. Our city, however, is facing unsustainable growing debt and conservative measures are need. Raising taxes is not the answer! As a local business woman, I will work collaboratively to find responsible solutions to our budget problems. Over the past 5 years, I have been a leader of open space and ridge-line protection, leading the way to the passage of the two strict preservation measures; both were overwhelmingly approved by city voters. I am a member of the Pleasanton’s Eastside Specific Plan-Task Force; plus a volunteer for the Pleasanton Heritage Assoc., Valley Humane Society, RAGE Soccer and our schools. I have the time and the passion to be a leader that listens and represents the people of Pleasanton. Visit www.Vote4Karla.com for more information. I would be honored if you would vote – Karla Brown for City Council.

JERRY PENTIN
Occupation: Small Business Owner
Age: 55
My education and qualifications are: This election is very important to the future of Pleasanton, as it will bring significant change to the city council. We need strong leadership to help sustain the healthy, safe and vibrant community that we all enjoy. Since moving to Pleasanton over 21 years ago, I've served on a variety of commissions and advisory groups, including my current role as chair of the Pleasanton Planning Commission. Previously, I was a Pleasanton Parks and Recreation Commissioner for six years, including time as chair. I also served on the Callippe Golf Course Committee and our group was honored with the Mayor's Award in 2005. I am a 28-year member of Rotary and Past President of the Pleasanton North Rotary Club and was honored as Rotarian of the Year in 2007 and 2011. As a local business owner, I've supported nonprofit agencies and youth organizations and was the recipient of the Pleasanton Chamber of Commerce's “2010 Excellence in Business” Award. We need to make sure we have experienced, qualified people on the council to make tough decisions. I believe I'm the most experienced and qualified candidate on the ballot and I would be honored to serve as your city council member. www.Pentin.com
### Candidates’ Statements
**CITY OF SAN LEANDRO**
**Councilmember, District 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DAN DILLMAN</strong></th>
<th><strong>MORGAN MACK-ROSE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation:</strong> Owner, Historic BAL Theatre</td>
<td><strong>Occupation:</strong> President, SLUSD Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My education and qualifications are:</strong> The status quo must go. The people of San Leandro need a true representative, a leader in the community who will serve as mediator, defender and Watcher over government, demanding accountability and transparency, protecting citizens and our tax dollars, while carefully guiding our city to success. This is how I will serve you on the City Council. We must erase the lines of division and clear a bright path to our future. I will fight for your rights and needs with the same passion I fight for Truth and Justice. Our city’s future can be redefined with a strong, vibrant economy with thriving services, shopping, dining, schools and entertainment, while enjoying safe neighborhoods. Achieving this will make our City stronger and more desirable enhancing the quality of our lives. We must strengthen our business community while remaining a hometown in which your family, friends and you, can live and thrive. My experience, dedication, and passion for our community has prepared me to build better bridges to our city’s future. Demand Change and Stand with me, Dan Dillman, this November. Dan Dillman, Xzault, The Historic BAL Theatre, 14808 East 14th Street, San Leandro CA 94578, 510-614-7700 office, <a href="mailto:dan@xzault.com">dan@xzault.com</a>, <a href="http://www.baltheatre.com">http://www.baltheatre.com</a></td>
<td><strong>My education and qualifications are:</strong> I’m running for City Council because I care for our city and its future. San Leandro is a diverse city with great possibilities, such as the new Fiber network and new Kaiser Hospital, but we’re missing out. We need an active Council member who will pursue these opportunities. I bring the proven ability to make tough decisions, bring people together, and make progress despite hard times. As a mother with daughters in San Leandro’s public schools, I understand the critical role schools play and as School Board President, during one of our history’s worst economies, I sought community input, prioritized accountability, and helped bring $200 million in construction projects on-time, under-budget, with union labor. I will bring this same drive and leadership as your council member. We must have a cohesive vision and actively pursue opportunities; creating high-tech incubators, encouraging local business, and promoting our city’s advantages. We must bring sustainability to our budget, prioritize libraries, parks, and community services which contribute to our daily quality of life, and fully staff our public safety departments. I bring the leadership, focus, and drive to deliver real results for San Leandro. I would be honored to have your vote. <a href="http://www.MorganForSanLeandro.com">www.MorganForSanLeandro.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>URSULA REED</strong></th>
<th><strong>MORGAN MACK-ROSE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation:</strong> San Leandro City Council Member</td>
<td><strong>Occupation:</strong> President, SLUSD Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age:</strong> 48</td>
<td><strong>Age:</strong> 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My education and qualifications are:</strong> As your Councilmember these past four years, and as your former Vice-Mayor, I’ve made it my top priorities to listen, build consensus among diverse communities, and find workable solutions. I’ve helped move San Leandro forward, with increased economic development, more job opportunities, and an improved quality of life. We’ve balanced our budget, opened our new Senior Center, moved forward with new developments that will create jobs and grow our economy like the Kaiser project and the Fiber Loop project, and we’re reducing blight and improving our Downtown with the development at the old Albertsons site. Going forward, you can count on me to focus on expanding economic opportunity, increasing public safety, and revitalizing our neighborhoods. I’ll pursue private/public partnerships to offset the lack of State funding, work towards a compatible shoreline development plan, and increase police technology, and I’m currently working to save San Leandro Hospital. My past service includes work as a school teacher, principal, and Library Commissioner. I’m also Chair of the County Housing Commission and a County Fire Commissioner. I’m supported by Senate Majority Leader Ellen Corbett, Mayor Emeritus Sheila Young, former Vice-Mayor Surlene Grant, and many more. Contact me with questions, comments, solutions: <a href="mailto:ReElectReed@gmail.com">ReElectReed@gmail.com</a>, <a href="http://www.UrsulaReed.com">www.UrsulaReed.com</a>.</td>
<td><strong>My education and qualifications are:</strong> I’m running for City Council because I care for our city and its future. San Leandro is a diverse city with great possibilities, such as the new Fiber network and new Kaiser Hospital, but we’re missing out. We need an active Council member who will pursue these opportunities. I bring the proven ability to make tough decisions, bring people together, and make progress despite hard times. As a mother with daughters in San Leandro’s public schools, I understand the critical role schools play and as School Board President, during one of our history’s worst economies, I sought community input, prioritized accountability, and helped bring $200 million in construction projects on-time, under-budget, with union labor. I will bring this same drive and leadership as your council member. We must have a cohesive vision and actively pursue opportunities; creating high-tech incubators, encouraging local business, and promoting our city’s advantages. We must bring sustainability to our budget, prioritize libraries, parks, and community services which contribute to our daily quality of life, and fully staff our public safety departments. I bring the leadership, focus, and drive to deliver real results for San Leandro. I would be honored to have your vote. <a href="http://www.MorganForSanLeandro.com">www.MorganForSanLeandro.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Candidates’ Statements
CITY OF SAN LEANDRO
Councilmember, District 4

CHRIS CROW
Occupation: Business Consultant
My education and qualifications are: As the economy recovers, San Leandro continues to compete for jobs, revenue, and a better quality of life for its citizens. Our City Council needs fresh energy, innovative ideas, and a modern perspective to navigate the economic and social challenges of the 21st century. I am a graduate of San Leandro’s Leadership Program and serve in the San Leandro Education Foundation, the San Leandro Sports Foundation, Rotary Club of San Leandro, Relay for Life, and the Measure M School Bond campaign, in addition to volunteering countless hours in our public schools. These efforts have led to new funding, improved assets, and a better perception of our community. As a former member of the Planning Commission I have a keen understanding of the various processes that occur within our city and have experience collaborating with others to make tough and important decisions. I have tremendous pride in our city and our people. Growing up and living most my life in San Leandro have shown me what great things our community can achieve. As your Council representative, I will work tirelessly to expand our business base, improve city services, and champion a quality of life for San Leandrans second to none. Please visit www.votechriscrow.com for more information.

BENNY LEE
Occupation: Statewide Non-Profit Technology and Financial Manager, City Commissioner, Homeowner’s Association President
Age: 47
My education and qualifications are: We can make San Leandro better and I will do my part to bring positive changes. My wife and I raised our child here and now that he’s in college I have more time to give back to our community. While serving as City of San Leandro Recreation and Parks Commissioner, Personnel Relations Board Member, Homeowner’s Association President, Asian Community Cultural Association President, and volunteer I’ve spoken with many of you and share your concerns and hopes. Public Safety is our top priority and above all else I will make sure that neighborhood policing and our firehouses remain fully staffed. With San Leandro leading the way in new technology, we can attract new businesses, increase shopping choices and bring good new jobs to San Leandro so we can turn commute time to family time. The city runs on your tax dollars and with my financial expertise I will make sure your money is spent wisely. My long-term goals are to fully restore library cuts, fix our roads, and make sure city services are accessible to all community members. I support schools and will work to increase cooperation with our school districts. Please vote Benny Lee for San Leandro City Council - District 4. www.ElectBennyLee.com

DARLENE DADEVU
Occupation: Business Professional
My education and qualifications are: A homeowner with a vested interest and goals to keep San Leandro a nice place to live. As a public servant since 1987, I have labored for public safety in Criminal Justice and I presently work in Public Health, Cultural Competency. Today’s world demands representatives who value diversity and recognize its impact on strength based policy making. I possess inclusionary vision, dedication and work experiences to achieve our goals of safety, economic stability and affordability. My private sector experience includes financial planning, private fiduciary and residential property landlord. Armed with graduate and undergraduate degrees in Business Administration, as well as public and private sector business experiences, I’m empowered and qualified to represent our community. Since my appointment as Senior Commissioner, I have been working to develop a community driven strategy to prevent violence and increase safety. We have a moral obligation to assist seniors not only because it is the right thing to do, but also to demonstrate our gratitude for their civic engagement and tax contributions to our City. In these recessionary times, we are in need of reasonable, reliable, hard working spokesperson to put forward our concerns. Therefore, I am humbly requesting your 1st or 2nd choice vote.
HERMY B. ALMONTE
Occupation: Vice-President, San Leandro School Board
Age: 53

My education and qualifications are: We cannot continue to talk about pension reform yet do nothing. The City is spending $13 million annually, or nearly 20% of its revenue, on pensions. Funds to repair streets, maintain senior services, and keep libraries and pools open are instead being used to pay for employee pensions. As San Leandro School Board Vice President, I made hard choices to balance budgets and preserve student programs. I supported the successful bond to renovate school athletic fields and collaborated with my colleagues to complete construction of the ninth grade campus and Arts Center under budget and on time. As your Councilmember, I will bring real reform to City Hall. We must negotiate leaner retirement packages for city employees, and generate new revenue by helping existing businesses and attracting new ones. San Leandro averages two residential burglaries daily. This is unacceptable. We must hire more police officers and step up efforts to keep our neighborhoods safe. My goals include preserving the Marina and shoreline and creating job opportunities for youth and empowering them to become leaders. I pledge to listen to you, work hard, act with integrity, be responsive to the needs of our diverse community, and always put the people of San Leandro first.

JIM PROLA
Occupation: San Leandro City Councilmember

My education and qualifications are: Serving the people of San Leandro as your Councilmember is an honor. My wife and I chose San Leandro to raise our family and it has been our home for 35 years. We raised three children here and take pride in being active parents, grandparents and citizens. Preserving San Leandro’s wonderful quality of life is important to all of us. Despite the economic downturn, I fought on the Council to save child care programs and branch libraries, keep San Leandro Hospital open, and move forward on constructing affordable housing for seniors. Working together, we reduced city pension costs by $2.8 million, produced a balanced budget, opened a new senior center, brought Kaiser to San Leandro, secured “Safe Routes to Schools” funding, and saved money by making the city more energy efficient. There is more work to be done. I will continue to take the lead in making public safety a priority and keeping our neighborhoods safe, bringing new business to our city, partnering with our schools for educational excellence, taking care of our seniors, and continuing on the path to fiscal stability. I am proud to be supported by State Senator Ellen Corbett and would be honored to have your vote. www.JimProla.org
Candidate’s Statement
CITY OF UNION CITY
Mayor

CAROL DUTRA-VERNACI
Occupation: Small Business Owner
Age: 58
My education and qualifications are: As a three-term Councilmember and lifelong Union City resident, I championed public safety, jobs, and an accountable, no-nonsense problem-solving approach. As your Mayor I’ll bring the same tradition of experienced, effective leadership to protecting our quality of life in this tough economy. With continued money grabs from Sacramento, this is no time for the inexperienced to lead our City! Working together, we’ve opened the Senior Center, built Union Landing, and transformed neighborhood parks. Ensuring your public safety has always been my top priority—I’ve fought to maintain our 911 services, support neighborhood policing, and the services that keep our children and youth away from gangs and drugs. I’ll continue to protect your essential community services and fight to get our fair share from Sacramento. My priorities are: Job Creation for emerging/green technologies and support for small businesses; Public Safety, including ensuring safe neighborhoods by deploying police to “hot spots;” Youth Programs – we must build the new Teen Center and continue to support after-school recreation. I’m honored to be endorsed by Hon. Delaine Eastin, Alameda County Supervisor Richard Valle, Mayor Mark Green, Union City Councilmembers, New Haven School Board Members, and the Union City Police Officers Association. Please join me: www.carolformayor.com
Candidate’s Statement
CITY OF UNION CITY
Councilmember

JIM NAVARRO
Occupation: Project Manager
My education and qualifications are: My decision to seek reelection to the City Council was based on my desire to effectively participate in decisions that will determine the future direction of our City. Our City must continue to progress both efficiently and effectively during these challenging economic times. It has been a privilege to have served you as your Councilmember for the past eight years. Since then, I’ve advocated strongly for public safety, fiscal responsibility, economic development and improved communications with our citizens. With Redevelopment money going away because of State mandate, it is more imperative to ensure that the projects we already have in placed are funded and completed. An experienced Councilmember is essential to the success of these projects and the future growth of our City. I recognize that each American has the right to have a secure basic human needs, and that includes affordable education, health care for all, good paying jobs, and, a safe and permanent affordable place to live. These problems are neither inevitable nor intractable. With that in mind, I am ready and prepared to tackle these issues facing Union City once again with vigor and resolve. I respectfully ask for your vote on November 6.
Candidates’ Statements
AC TRANSIT DISTRICT
Director, At-Large

DOLLENE C. JONES
Occupation: Retired Bus Driver
My education and qualifications are: I, Dollene Jones, a candidate for the at-large seat on the AC Transit Board, retired from driving AC Transit bus routes for 21 years and own a private shuttle bus service that caters to the people of the Bay Area including the physically handicapped and older elderly seniors. With a combination of experience as an employee and owner in the transit industry, I bring qualities to inspire proactive responsiveness from the Board of Directors. Having driven routes in the San Pablo Avenue, Telegraph Avenue - Foothill Boulevard, McArthur Boulevard, International Avenue - Mission Street and Transbay corridors, I have experienced the frustrations of passengers, AC Transit drivers and route supervisors. In my twenty one service years, I have seen both bus and customer service at AC Transit go from good to bad. It is now just plain ugly. I propose the following steps to reinvigorate AC Transit and increase ridership: Institute zero based budgeting; Increase on-time service; Increase service frequency and hours of operation; Reduce non-essential blue and white collar workers; Decrease the frequency and costs of consultant contracts; Create an interagency Transit Outage Emergency Response Team.

H.E. CHRISTIAN (CHRIS) PEEPLES
Occupation: AC Transit District Director, At-Large
Age: 65
My education and qualifications are: I have been riding AC Transit buses for almost 40 years. Twelve years ago I gave up my car and now go everywhere by transit. AC Transit is hiring more operators and mechanics to improve reliability. We need to add back more service. All of that takes money. I have helped get federal, state and local money. AC Transit spends your money wisely. We now buy buses in Hayward, engines in San Leandro and NextBus from Alameda. We have reduced management and pay our top management less than before. I took a 5% reduction in pay, get no pension and pay 10% toward my health care. I have always lead in support for AC Transit’s hydrogen fuel cell bus program — the largest and most advanced in the country — grant funded so it does not impact service. I have supported better access for disabled persons and low fares for school children. My longstanding effort on mass transit issues and my years of hard work on AC Transit’s Board have led to endorsements from Congresswoman Barbara Lee, the Sierra Club, Senator Hancock, Assemblymembers Skinner and Wieckowski and many others. Further details and contact information: www.smartvoter.org/vote/peeples; (510) 326-6841; chris_peeples@yahoo.com. Thank you for your vote.
JOE WALLACE
Occupation: AC Transit Vice-President Board of Directors
Age: 58
My education and qualifications are: Since being appointed to the AC Transit Board in year 2000 and being transit dependant I have focused on our budget crisis and doing the work that is necessary to reduce costs. This last year has been one of great reflection as I have had to make tough decisions and witness firsthand the pleas of people that use the bus to conduct the their daily activities. As an organization will get through these difficult times and I am optimistic for the future. My calling as a board member is simply to provide affordable, reliable, and efficient bus service. But, as our community struggles from the lingering affects of the economic crisis, I can’t help to think about how AC can serve our community beyond simply providing bus service. How can we better serve that small business that desperately needs help, our local schools that are facing massive budget deficits, or the un-employed workers? If I am elected, my focus will be making AC a better community partner and getting AC to help address problems facing our community.

YELDA BARTLETT
Occupation: Attorney/City Commissioner
Age: 34
My education and qualifications are: AC Transit is in crisis. Fares are up while service has declined. Aging buses contribute to poor air quality and some of the highest child asthma rates in the state. As a life-long bus rider, I know we need a bus system that is safe, reliable, and clean-powered. This will be my goal as your AC Transit director. I am an attorney, community advocate, chairwoman of the Berkeley Commission on the Status of Women and former commissioner of the Berkeley Environmental Commission. I have a proven track record in solving difficult problems. I am endorsed by AC Transit District Director Harper, former Directors Hawley and Wiggins, MTC Commissioner and City of Berkeley Mayor Bates, as well as host of local officials. If elected, I will champion clean, renewable energy facilities and equipment that reduce pollution and global warming. I will focus on data-driven budget solutions and improve effectiveness of transit service while respecting the rights of AC Transit workers. I will advocate for open, responsive government to ensure the public’s voice is heard. Historically, we had one of the best bus systems in the country. Help me make AC Transit a great bus system again. I thank you for your vote.
CANDIDATES’ STATEMENTS
BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT
Director, District 3

REBECCA SALTZMAN
Occupation: Environmental Policy Manager
My education and qualifications are: I’m supported by Sierra Club and Amalgamated Transit Union Local 1555 because my years of transit advocacy and management experience have prepared me for this job. As Government Affairs Manager for the California League of Conservation Voters, I help pass state laws protecting California’s transit systems and environment. I became Vice-Chair of Oakland’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee to work with the public to improve transportation. BART needs to be more responsive to riders and taxpayers. BART is currently $7.5 billion short in its budget for basic repairs. As your BART Director, I’ll make BART more fiscally and environmentally sustainable. I’ll push for new trains and modernized, cleaner stations. Most trains are over 40 years old. Building new trains will improve the system and create jobs. I’ll strengthen BART’s relationship with other transit agencies, ensuring seamless trips for passengers. And I’ll work to bring accountability to the BART Board, scheduling meetings when the public can provide input. My vision for a better BART is also supported by former Assemblymember Johan Klehs, San Leandro Mayor Stephen Cassidy, Albany Vice-Mayor Marge Atkinson, Oakland Councilmember Rebecca Kaplan, Councilmembers from Berkeley, El Cerrito, and Moraga, and AC Transit President Elsa Ortiz. www.RebeccaForBART.com

ANTHONY PEGRAM, P.E., MBA
Occupation: Engineer, Principal Contract Specialist
My education and qualifications are: I am a Licensed Engineer with an MBA and resident of the Bay Area for over 40 years. As a BART employee for over 20 years I have worked on the San Francisco and Oakland Airport Extensions, the East Contra Costa Extension, Rail Vehicle Rehabilitation and Vehicle Procurement Projects. This direct experience allows me to integrate my knowledge of BART’s operating procedures with my experience on public boards and commissions including Oakland’s Landmarks Board, Planning Commission, Base Reuse Authority and the Alameda County Fair Board. I will ensure that District policies are fiscally sound and demonstrate sensitivity to the diverse needs of the public. I will make safety a priority and address cleanliness of facilities. I will ensure accommodation of the changing passenger demographics including the elderly, disabled, those with limited English proficiency and bicyclists. I will focus on enhancing BART’s services to meet the demand. I will work cooperatively with other transit agencies to ensure that BART promotes the most efficient utilization of all transit modes. Vote for me and I will bring my public board experience and the wealth of knowledge I have gained as a BART employee together to provide the best possible leadership for the District.

FRED WRIGHT LOPEZ
Occupation: Retired Attorney/Volunteer
Age: 63
My education and qualifications are: Accountability, public safety, fiscal solvency, cleanliness of stations and trains, service dependability, expansion and accessibility by the blind, disabled and seniors are some of the major issues which BART must confront. I pledge to advocate for these issues on behalf of all residents of BART District 3. My Qualifications Include: Current Appointee - Policy Advisory Council, Metropolitan Transportation Commission. Previous service: Citizens Advisory Council, Contra Costa Transportation Authority; Citizens Review Board Oakland Police Department; Board Member Lion’s Blind Center Oakland; and Board Member Boalt Hall Law Alumni Association. My Experience Includes: Attorney U.S. Treasury Department, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. Formerly served as Special Assistant U.S. Attorney Criminal Prosecutions, Arizona; and Staff Attorney, Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health Education and Welfare / Health and Human Services. Education: UC Berkeley Law School Boalt Hall, JD; Undergraduate studies, UC Berkeley and UCLA, BA, History.
JOHN MCPARTLAND
Occupation: President, BART Board of Directors, Retired Army Colonel, Retired Fire Chief
My education and qualifications are: John McPartland is a lifelong public servant with a distinguished career of success, from Private to Army Colonel and decorated combat veteran, from Firefighter to Chief Officer in the Oakland Fire Department and from Safety Specialist to the Board Directors in BART. He succeeds by achieving goals. In his first term as Director in BART, John has opened the West Dublin/Pleasanton Station, expanded the Earthquake Retrofit Program, reformed the Police Department, implemented an Earthquake Early Warning System to stop trains before the shaking starts and prevent both derailments and injuries to the public, and he is working to accelerate the BART to Livermore Project, which will also relieve highway congestion and create hundreds of jobs. Endorsed by: Alameda County Supervisors: Haggerty, Miley and Valle, Mayors Marchand-Livermore, Sbranti-Dublin, Sweeney-Hayward, Green-Union City, and 7 of the 8 BART Board Members. John has a Master’s Degree in Public Administration, serves as an Alternate Member on both the Alameda County Transportation Commission and Capital Corridor, and is a past member of the California Seismic Safety Commission. www.McPartlandforBART.com

JOHN F. MAHER
Occupation: Former BART employee
My education and qualifications are: I am a former BART employee with over 36 years of experience. I served as Local 790 (now Local 1021) vice president, and contributed in the negotiation of 7 contracts. My priorities as Director for District 5 will be to ensure that BART remains focused on safety and affordability for low-income and student riders; support cost effective route extensions, such as service to Livermore; and work to ensure that service equipment, BART cars and maintenance equipment, pass strict quality controls. My first focus will be to ensure that the new BART cars are safe and meet all required contract specifications prior to being put into service. In addition, I will work to increase safety by ensuring that BART Police personnel are continually trained to the highest standards. My prior BART experience has given me the insight to work effectively with all BART employees. With your vote, I will work with labor and management to improve service for the riding public. I will make my office available for any of your concerns, and I will respond directly to your issues presented to me. I remain dedicated to high standards and service, and I respectively solicit your vote. Thank you.
Candidates’ Statements

BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT
Director, District 7

MARGARET GORDON

Occupation: Environment Justice/Transportation Justice Advocate
Age: 65

My education and qualifications are: My running for the board BART is about public service for the unseen stakeholders that aren’t being representative through out the BART system now. As we know much of the land use for the system, mostly touch the low wealth and runs in work class communities, which are African Americans and communities of color, that haven’t benefiting from the BART systems as an institution of mass transportation. Years of promises have been made to service these communities, today these same communities are living with fewer services, and less voices in decision making. There’s a need to stress the values of everyday people be more engagement, which seems not being valued in public transportation arenas, also to develop spaces and places no matter socioeconomics for participation is more the standard public involvement requirements. I see one of the many ought are to increase the representation of next generation, as a regional transportation institution. BART has no formal process for youth to voices or be heard, it’s very important that implementation plan happen the support the next policy-makers as a learning system and concrete material for education and career advancement.

ZAKHARY MALLETT

Occupation: City/Transportation Planner

My education and qualifications are: As of December, 2011, 83% of the population of BART District 7 is now concentrated in the East Bay. It is time for District 7 to be represented by someone who is local to the heart of this district. As an East Bay resident and trained city/transportation planner, I am in the prime position to fulfill this purpose. One of my biggest priorities as your local candidate is regional fare equity. We, East Bay riders, subsidize San Franciscans by paying such disproportionately higher fares that San Franciscans effectively ride BART for free at our expense! Such regressive cross-subsidies in BART fares must end! As your representative, I will also work diligently to put an end to non-stop elevator/escalator outages by pressing for system upgrades instead of costly and endless repairs. Finally, we need traffic relief on Interstate 80, the region’s most-congested corridor, which can only be achieved with better transit options upstream. That’s why I want to finish what I started last year by pressing for a study and eventual extension of BART beyond Richmond. Vote for East Bay representation! Vote for regional transit service equality! Vote for responsible leadership! Vote Zakhary Mallett for BART District 7! We Deserve Better!
Candidates’ Statements
CITY OF ALAMEDA HEALTHCARE DISTRICT
Directors

J. MICHAEL MCCORMICK
Occupation: Alameda Health Care Director, Semi Retired College Instructor, Business Person
My education and qualifications are: With the nearest emergency room over 20 minutes away, Alameda Hospital remains a critical community asset. I am seeking an additional term to enhance quality care and protect our local safety net during difficult financial times. During my almost 4 years on the board, I led efforts to stabilize the hospital through expanding outpatient services, creating a new wound center, assuring stroke certification, and creating a new center for nursing home patients. As the finance chair, I led efforts to increase state funding and build support among local and state elected officials. We are one of the lowest cost hospitals in the County that continues to offer excellent care. The hospital is supported by tax payers, so I have advocated for more transparency and careful allocation of scarce dollars. The hospital continues to face opportunities and challenges as we prepare for healthcare expansion in 2014, and I want to assist in those endeavors. My family spent over 60 years in the healthcare occupations, my wife is an Alameda County Supervisor specializing in healthcare policy, and I have a professional finance background having run a successful independent business for twenty five years. I would be honored to have your support.

JORDAN BATTANI
Occupation: Healthcare Strategy Consultant
My education and qualifications are: Six years of service on the City of Alameda Healthcare District Board, currently as Board President; more than 30 years of professional healthcare leadership experience in a variety of hospital, physician, health plan and consulting organizations; nationally known thought leader on healthcare reform and technology; Masters degrees in Business Administration and Public Health. As District Board President, my focus has been on ensuring clinical service excellence and long term financial sustainability for Alameda Hospital. During my tenure the hospital has achieved national recognition and certification for the clinical quality of its programs and operations. In pursuit of long term financial sustainability, Alameda Hospital has implemented rigorous cost management programs and begun the expansion of high value healthcare services and programs designed to meet current, and future, community needs as well as provide new sources of revenue. The commitment that the taxpayers have made to supporting Alameda Hospital, and local healthcare services, is an inspiring example of community spirit and responsibility. It has been my privilege to serve this effort. Please return me to office to continue this important work. Vote for Jordan Battani for City of Alameda Healthcare District Director.
RICH HALKET
Occupation: Incumbent/ Certified Public Accountant
Age: 42

My education and qualifications are: As a Certified Public Accountant I bring extensive financial knowledge to the Dublin San Ramon Services District Board of Directors. This experience is especially important in this uncertain economy. DSRSD faces critical financial issues such as refinancing debt and setting connection fees and rates. I support a prudent balance between keeping rates as low as possible while maintaining the District’s financial health. The 2008 financial crisis demonstrated that issues outside of our borders affect us. The crisis in the Delta is one such issue. Our water is drawn from the same pumps that supply Central Valley farms and Southern California. Therefore threats to the State Water Project directly affect us. We cannot afford to wait for a delta fix. I believe DSRSD must seek additional water sources so we are not held hostage to events in the Delta. We should explore technologies such as the regional desalination project, rainwater capture, and grey water irrigation. The expansion of our recycled water system is one example of a new source that extends our water supply. Irrigation with recycled water frees up potable water for more beneficial uses. I ask for your support so I can serve you on the Dublin San Ramon Services District Board.

SCOTT HAYES
Occupation: Businessman
Age: 30

My education and qualifications are: I am a financially conservative private sector businessman that has never ran for public office. I hold a BBA in Finance from the University of Texas at Arlington and a MBA from the University of Notre Dame. My professional background is in financial analysis, systems, project management, and business process improvement. I work full time for a large privately held manufacturing and sales company, where I have been for four years. My current job title is Systems and Data Manager, and before that it was Senior Financial Analyst. As a member of the DSRSD Board of Directors, I will create value through a focus on efficiency, cost control, and long term financial sustainability. I will be an agent for change and will leverage my practical, results oriented approach to challenge the organization to live up to its full potential. I look forward to serving the customers of Dublin San Ramon Services District.

DWIGHT L. (PAT) HOWARD
Occupation: Incumbent
Age: 67

My education and qualifications are: Bachelor and Master of Science degrees in Mechanical Engineering from UC Berkeley and an MS degree in Engineering Management from Santa Clara University. I am a licensed Professional Engineer with over 30 years of engineering experience including leadership positions. These past few years have been some of the most challenging years in local government history. The collapse of the bond and real estate markets combined with escalating pension costs have driven some agencies to bankruptcy. Not at DSRSD! We have restructured our debt at low fixed rates. We have negotiated new employee contracts that are fair and sensible. Our pension costs are under control. If reelected, I will continue to work for fiscal responsibility while maintaining our water and wastewater rates at the lowest sustainable rates in the valley. My priorities are to continue to expand our water recycling program and work toward valley-wide water/wastewater services consolidation. It’s been an honor to serve on the DSRSD Board since 2008. Please feel free to contact me at dwight.howard@comcast.net with any comments or questions. Thank you for your continued support.

EDWARD R. DUARTE
Occupation: General Engineering Contractor

My education and qualifications are: It is my belief that every citizen should do his or her part to help make their community a better place to live. That means making a commitment of time and energy to contribute your part for the betterment of our society as a whole. I do have the time and the desire to serve, so I can bring a fresh perspective to the operations of the Dublin San Ramon Services District. I have lived and been a business owner in San Ramon for the last 33 years and have been an active supporter of the community. I am a past recipient of the Citizen of the Year award from the San Ramon Chamber and Past President of the San Ramon Rotary club. I have also served on the San Ramon Citizen’s Advisory Committee for Redevelopment, and am currently President of the Board of Directors for the Valley Children’s Museum in Dublin. I am running for the board of DSRSD because I have extensive experience in working for municipal water agencies as a prime contractor on numerous plants around Northern California. My business experience will be of benefit to the District and its citizens, and I ask for your vote.
AUDIE BOCK
Occupation: Author/Scholarship Director/Businesswoman

My education and qualifications are: Watching the Oakland Hills Fire on TV in Japan, where I was teaching near Tokyo, was a horrifying experience; thankfully my parents’ home was spared. Serving on the Alameda County Grand Jury in 2006-2007 from our unincorporated area, I learned that first responders’ lack of interoperability in their communications systems had cost lives and property in the Oakland Fire. Recent revelations from law enforcement show that this problem persists today in the Bay Area. Enrolling in the Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) training offered by the Hayward Fire Department in 2010, I was surprised that I was the first from my area to take this free course. Worse yet, I learned that the topography of Fairview, with its lovely hills and stream gullies, pastures and trails with old growth eucalyptus and pine lends itself to the type of high-velocity updraft wildfire that destroyed so much of Oakland. We must ensure a smoothly communicating, fast response emergency system at the most economical cost to our community. I am committed to helping Fairview residents evaluate our options, prepare for a disaster that may some day strike, and preserve our property rights and independent way of life. Please vote for me.
Candidate’s Statement
LIVERMORE AREA RECREATION & PARK DISTRICT
Director, Short-Term

BOB COOMBER
Occupation: Appointed Incumbent
My education and qualifications are: As a passionate believer in fitness, fun and fiscal good behavior, I believe I am the perfect choice for this opportunity to serve on LARPD’s Board of Directors. I’m a 2007 inductee to the California Outdoors Hall of Fame, as well as a 2008 recipient of the President’s Council on Physical Fitness Community Leadership award. In my professional life I hold responsibility for budget, operations and personnel matters within my department, and understand the challenges the District faces as we work hard to deliver the highest quality services while facing declining revenues. If I were to break down my message to an essence, it would be that as a Board member I seek to provide the widest range of recreation opportunities to a diverse, growing, multifaceted community. I ask for your vote on November 6, 2012. Thank you.
ROLAND J. DIAS  
**Occupation:** Director, Oro Loma Sanitary District  
**My education and qualifications are:** When first elected to the Oro Loma Board, I pledged to keep sewer and garbage rates low. Oro Loma’s annual sewer rate of $189 is the lowest in Alameda County. Garbage rates have been reduced since 1991 with the minimum residential rate dropping from $10.40 a month to just $7.26. Oro Loma’s rate allows a customer to have garbage, recycling and green waste collected at a cost ($11.86) amongst the lowest in Alameda County. The District eliminated the use of chlorine (a dangerous gas) and replaced it with environmentally friendly hypochlorite, thus eliminating significant potential danger to our community. As Chairman of the District’s Finance Committee, I had the finance staff replace high interest rate bonds with low interest rate bonds, saving taxpayers $2.3 million. Laython Landis and myself successfully oversaw a $34.1 million treatment plant upgrade and $25 million collection system upgrade. These projects help us to continue to protect public health and safety. In my business career, I have held positions in engineering, finance, and management. My experience is backed by a proven record of accomplishments, honesty and dedication. Your vote for Roland J. Dias will assure the best service at the lowest possible cost. Questions? Call 510-276-7440.

SHEILIA YOUNG  
**Occupation:** Business Woman  
**My education and qualifications are:** Have lived and served in the Oro Loma Sanitary District for more than 34 years, including service as Mayor of San Leandro from 1998 through 2006, a period of economic growth and financial stability. Possess the knowledge, education and experience to address our wastewater collection and treatment needs and to provide innovative and cost-effective solid waste and recycling services. Previously served as a member and also Chair of the East Bay Dischargers Authority, a joint powers organization formed to collectively manage wastewater treatment and disposal services for a population in Alameda County of 800,000. I also served as President of both the Alameda County Waste Management Authority and the Source Reduction and Recycling Board. These agencies are responsible for the environmental choices and changes that make us so much more productive and mindful of waste reduction and recycling. I would be the first woman to serve on the Oro Loma Board and have the proven tools to assist the District in decisions regarding our future. It is time for a new perspective on the Board and one that offers innovative thinking focused on our future. I respectively ask for your support on November 6th.

LAYTHON NEAL LANDIS  
**Occupation:** Director, Oro Loma Sanitary District  
**My education and qualifications are:** Oro Loma’s sewer rates are the State’s lowest. We implemented mandated recycling, achieving a waste reduction of 80%, while lowering garbage rates. We replaced dangerous chlorine with environmentally friendly hypochlorite. Our improved engines burn methane producing 92% of our electrical needs. Roland Dias and I oversaw a $34.1 million treatment plant expansion and a $25 million collection system upgrade. These projects will continue to protect public health and safety. These accomplishments were done with integrity, honesty, dedication, employee respect, and good judgement. Through the efforts of Director Dias and myself, they were achieved and shall continue with your vote. My engineering, finance, and business management background, along with over 40 years of experience in managing waste materials and wastewater, have been invaluable. The coming years at Oro Loma will be challenging; however, your vote for Laython Neal Landis will assure the best possible service at the lowest possible cost. Questions? Call 510-357-6048.
COUNTY OF ALAMEDA MEASURE A1

A1 OAKLAND ZOO HUMANE ANIMAL CARE/EDUCATION PROTECTION MEASURE. To maintain/upgrade humane animal care and basic needs (food, medical, heating, cooling, safe enclosures); retain veterinarians/animal specialists; care for wounded/Endangered animals; support wildlife conservation; maintain children’s educational, nature/science programs, field trips; and keep entrance fees affordable; shall Alameda County levy a tax of $12/parcel annually for residential parcels and comparable commercial/industrial rates, with low-income senior exemptions, mandatory audits, and citizens’ oversight?

YES NO

COUNTY COUNSEL’S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE A1

ANALYSIS BY THE COUNTY COUNSEL OF AN ALAMEDA COUNTY SPECIAL PARCEL TAX MEASURE TO SUPPORT THE OAKLAND ZOO

Measure A1 seeks voter approval to authorize an annual special parcel tax on each parcel of taxable real property following adoption of the measure until December 31, 2037. The tax will fund certain services and projects at the Oakland Zoo (“Zoo”).

The authority to levy special taxes upon approval by two-thirds of the votes cast on special tax measures is pursuant to Article XlllA of the California Constitution and sections 23027 and 50075 of the California Government Code.

If two-thirds of the qualified electors voting on this measure do not vote for approval, the measure will fail, and the County will not be authorized to levy the special tax outlined above.

DONNA R. ZIEGLER
County Counsel

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure A1, which is printed in full in this sample ballot pamphlet. If you desire an additional copy of the measure, please call the Elections Official’s office at (510) 272-6933 and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you. You may also access the full text of the measure on the Alameda County website at the following address: www.acgov.org/rov/.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE A1

The animals at the Oakland Zoo need your help! Vote YES on A1 to give Oakland Zoo animals the quality, humane care they deserve.

YES on A1 cares for and meets the basic needs of Zoo animals:

• YES on A1 ensures animals are safe and enclosures well maintained
• YES on A1 provides animals food, heating/cooling, and clean, fresh watering systems
• YES on A1 repairs aging animal shelters and deteriorating sewage/drainage systems, some of which are 40+ years old
• YES on A1 retains quality veterinarians to care for sick and aging animals

YES on A1 supports the Zoo’s work with wildlife conservation and animal rescue organizations, saving animals wounded in the wild. YES on A1 gives sanctuary to endangered species, such as the California Condor; retired circus animals, including lions, tigers and elephants; and animals rescued from abuse.

Measure A1 is endorsed by leading conservation organizations including Ventana Wildlife Society, Felidae Conservation Fund and Bay Area Puma Project.

The Oakland Zoo educates children about wildlife and nature in a way that just isn’t possible through books. More than 200,000 Alameda County children visited the Zoo last year.

YES on A1 doubles the number of school children served by the Zoo at a time when local schools are cutting science programs and field trips.

• YES on A1 maintains children’s educational programs/school field trips
• YES on A1 provides science/nature education to students who often have none in schools

Measure A1 requires strict fiscal accountability, including independent financial audits, citizens oversight, and an Expenditure Plan to ensure funds are spent as promised. Low-income seniors are exempt.

At only $1 per month, veterinarians, teachers, and Alameda County families agree YES on A1 is a small price to pay to protect Zoo educational programs and ensure animals receive quality, humane care.


s/Nate Miley
President, Alameda County Board of Supervisors
s/Joel J. Parrott
Veterinarian, Executive Director, Oakland Zoo
s/Sheila Jordan
Alameda County Superintendent of Schools
s/Judith Cox
Government Accountability and Transparency Advocate
s/Caleb Cheung
Recipient of Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE A1

Measure A1 sounds good—who doesn’t support animal welfare and education? But there are troubling provisions in this measure you might want to check out for yourself.

First, the measure lumps in so many spending options that there’s no requirement the money will go for what the ballot summary says it will. In fact, it specifically lets zoo executives delete items and spend the money for other things, including expanding, constructing and financing new facilities —allowing them to direct parcel taxes to their proposed new big expansion that would put a three-story visitor center, restaurant, gift shop and bay view offices atop rare wildlife and plant habitat in Knowland Park.

Second, the public can’t ever amend the measure, except to extend or increase taxes—no matter how bad economic conditions get. Low-income senior citizens would have to file for an exemption directly with the zoo operator each and every year. And the zoo is run by a private nonprofit corporation with no publicly elected representatives and isn’t required to follow California’s open records and meetings laws.

There are many other needs right now that are higher priority. Schools, libraries, and government services for the needy require money, too. We can’t afford everything. Zoo executives need to live within their means like the rest of us.

This election offers a real choice between something very costly—in dollars and environmental losses—and something priceless: defending Knowland Park’s ecological treasures and good public policy. Vote No on Measure A1! www.saveknowland.org

s/Laura Baker
Committee Member, East Bay Chapter of the California Native Plant Society
s/Ruth E Malone
Co-Chair, Friends of Knowland Park
s/Jeff Miller
Director, Alameda Creek Alliance
s/Jim Hanson
President, California Native Grasslands Association
s/Elizabeth Baker
Vice President, Resource Renewal Institute
ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE A1

Vote NO on this measure. Even if you love the zoo, this tax is bad public policy, creating an open checkbook for zoo executives to use for virtually any zoo expense. It forces Alameda County taxpayers to pay at least $112 million in Oakland Zoo bills over the next 25 years.

The zoo already takes in millions in public funding, including city funds, hotel taxes, Regional Park District funds, bonds money and a State Parks grant. But zoo executives want more— to build a “supersized” expansion project in unspoiled Knowland Park, Oakland’s largest and biologically richest park, paving over threatened wildlife habitat and rare native plant communities.

The Sierra Club and other environmental groups opposed the controversial Knowland Park expansion. Now zoo executives say they won’t use these funds for it. But loopholes explicitly written into this tax measure give the zoo carte blanche to spend the funds for “constructing” and “expanding”—or to add projects later.

Even if not used to build zoo executives’ expansion with its bay view offices, the taxes free up other funds for this. So, while the public may think it’s voting to create humane conditions for captive animals, there’s no guarantee they aren’t unwittingly voting to fund extensive environmental damage in Knowland Park and destruction of threatened native wildlife habitat.

Zoo executives now claim they haven’t enough money to care for the animals they already have, while planning to spend multi-millions on a big expansion. When governments are struggling to cover basic services and programs, is this top priority? It just doesn’t add up.

Show zoo executives and politicians that you want honest dialogue about public spending priorities that includes protecting native wildlife habitat AND caring for cherished zoo animals. Please vote NO on Measure A1! More info: www.saveknowland.org

s/Laura Baker
East Bay Chapter of the California Native Plant Society
s/Ruth E Malone
Co-Chair, Friends of Knowland Park
s/Jim Hanson
President, California Native Grasslands Association
s/Jeff Miller
Director, Alameda Creek Alliance
s/Elizabeth Baker
Vice President, Resource Renewal Institute

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE A1

Did the opponents even bother to read the official ballot language? Vote YES on A1—the money is legally required to be spent on Humane Animal Care! Read the official wording yourself in your voter handbook.

FACT: Measure A1’s Expenditure Plan specifies that ALL funds must be spent as promised to taxpayers, for the following purposes:

- Quality Humane Animal Care
- Basic Animal Needs
- Educational Programs for Children
- Maintaining Zoo Affordability/Visitor Safety

FACT: Measure A1 requires an Independent Citizens Oversight Committee to ensure funds are spent as promised to you, the taxpayer. By law, the A1 Oversight Committee must include Conservation/Environmental and Animal Rights representatives, the League of Women Voters, Taxpayer and Senior advocates, and a PTA representative.

FACT: YES on A1 costs just $1/month—pennies a day—to give Oakland Zoo animals quality care.

“YES on A1 allows the Oakland Zoo to continue quality care for Zoo animals.”

- Jim Maddy, President/CEO, National Association of Zoos & Aquariums

“Oakland Zoo animals deserve quality care. Many are retired circus animals or animals rescued from abuse—YES on A1 ensures more animals can be rescued and get the care they need.”

- Laura Maloney, Chief Operating Officer, Humane Society of the United States and Pat Derby, Co-Director, Performing Animal Welfare Society (PAWS)

“YES on A1 supports the Oakland Zoo’s wildlife conservation and animal rescue efforts, saving animals wounded in the wild and giving sanctuary to endangered species.”

- Ron Kagan, Founding Member, Center for Zoo Animal Welfare

Join us: www.itsyourzoo.com

s/Kimberly R. Carlson
Veterinarian/President, Alameda County Veterinary Medical Association
s/Betty T. Yee
Board of Equalization Member
s/Joel Parrott
Veterinarian, Executive Director, Oakland Zoo
s/Judith A. Cox
Govt. Accountability & Transparency Advocate
s/Gary Twitchell
Knowland Park Neighbor & lifetime Sierra Club Member
FULL TEXT OF MEASURE A1
AN ORDINANCE ADDING CHAPTER 2.30
TO TITLE 2 OF THE ALAMEDA COUNTY
ORDINANCE CODE TO ESTABLISH A SPECIAL
TAX TO SUPPORT THE OAKLAND ZOO

WHEREAS, the Oakland Zoo is a regional, cultural attraction that thousands of children and families from all over Alameda County visit and enjoy; and

WHEREAS, the Zoo hosts more than 660,000 visitors annually and has 25,000 household (70,000 individual) members, nearly two-thirds of whom are from Alameda County; and

WHEREAS, animals in the Zoo deserve quality humane care, the Zoo must maintain the ability to meet the basic needs of the animals, which includes providing food, heating/cooling, clean and fresh watering systems, and repairing and maintaining aging animal shelters; and

WHEREAS, it is essential that the Zoo retain specialists to adequately care for sick and aging animals at its veterinary hospital, as most animals live significantly longer in a zoo than they might in the wild, creating unique veterinary care needs; and

WHEREAS, one of the essential missions of the Zoo is to educate children and youth about wildlife, life science, and nature in a way that is not possible through books, and approximately 350,000 children and youth participate in the Zoo’s educational programs annually, with more than 70% of the Zoo’s educational programs delivered to Alameda County residents; and

WHEREAS, with continuing State cuts to education, the Zoo must maintain affordable and accessible education programs, including school field trips for children who are already underserved by budget cuts in Alameda County schools; and

WHEREAS, additional funding is necessary to meet current and anticipated facility maintenance, repair and upgrade needs, in that some of the Zoo’s drainage and plumbing systems are over 40 years old, seismic upgrades may be warranted, and lighting and electrical systems need improvements for energy efficiency and added safety; and

WHEREAS, investments in the Zoo allow it to partner with wildlife conservation and animal rescue organization to help save, protect and care for vulnerable wildlife, including giving sanctuary to endangered species such as the California Condor and retired circus animals; and

WHEREAS, the amount of revenue available to the Zoo from existing revenue sources is inadequate to meet the costs of providing for the advancement of humane animal care and veterinary treatment programs, maintenance of quality animal and visitor services, including children/youth educational and wildlife preservation programs, and repairing and improving Zoo enclosures and facilities; and

WHEREAS, this special tax will provide the Zoo with necessary additional funding to continue to provide and maintain quality programs and services to visitors from throughout Alameda County, including but not limited to:

- Meeting the basic needs of the animals, including food, heating and cooling, and clean, fresh watering systems.
- Ensuring animals are safe and enclosures are well maintained, with natural and humane conditions.
- Providing essential medical care to sick and aging animals.
- Upgrading, repairing, and replacing the Zoo’s deteriorating sewage, drainage and plumbing systems, and making important lighting and electrical system improvements for energy efficiency and safety.
- Continuing to offer educational programs and school field trips for children who are already underserved by budget cuts in Alameda County schools.
- Maintaining the veterinary hospital and skilled animal healthcare providers.
- Providing important science and nature education to school children who often have none in public schools.
- Keeping entrance fees affordable for all Zoo visitors.
- Ensuring Zoo visitor safety.
- Continuing to work with wildlife conservation and animal rescue organizations to provide Zoo care for animals wounded in the wild and sanctuary to endangered species such as the California Condor or retired circus animals; and

WHEREAS, the special tax imposed by this Chapter is authorized by Article XIII A of the California Constitution and sections 23027 and 50075 of the California Government Code.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE PEOPLE OF THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA THAT:

SECTION I
Chapter 2.30, entitled “The OAKLAND ZOO HUMANE ANIMAL CARE/EDUCATION PROTECTION MEASURE,” and consisting of Sections 2.30.010 to 2.30.080 of Title 2 of the Alameda County Ordinance Code is hereby added as follows:

Section 2.30.010. Definitions.
A. “Fund” means the Oakland Zoo Fund created pursuant to Section 2.30.030.
B. “Multi-family residential parcel” means all parcels that are improved with more than one residential unit.
C. “Nonresidential parcel” means all parcels that are improved with uses other than residences.
D. “Oakland Zoo” or “Zoo” means the zoological park known as the Oakland Zoo, owned by the City of Oakland and located in Knowland Park in the City of Oakland. At the time of adoption of this Chapter, the Zoo is operated by the East Bay Zoological Society pursuant to a management agreement with the City of Oakland.
E. “Oakland Zoo Special Tax” and “special tax” mean the tax authorized and imposed pursuant to Section 2.30.020.
F. “Occupant” means the person or persons who rent, lease, reside in, or otherwise occupy real property located within Alameda County.

G. “Owner” means the owner or owners of the real property located within Alameda County.

H. “Services and Projects” mean the operations of the Oakland Zoo, including but not limited to acquisition of, caring for, and publicly displaying animals, deployment of appropriate personnel, and maintaining, operating, and improving existing facilities; providing and supporting educational and conservation programs involving, without limitation, animals, native habitats, and nature, as well as other Zoo-related programs; community outreach; constructing, expanding, remodeling, renovating, furnishing, equipping, or financing of facilities; keeping visitor fees affordable; and maintaining and improving visitor services. Financing the construction of new or renovation of existing Oakland Zoo capital facilities is within the definition of services and projects. The Zoo operator may use special tax funds to provide services anywhere in Alameda County, but may not use them for programs and projects outside of Alameda County. Services and projects are more fully defined in the Expenditure Plan approved by the voters of Alameda County as part of approving the Oakland Zoo Special Tax.

I. “Single-family residential parcel” means all parcels which are improved with only one residential unit.

J. “Zoo operator” means the operator of the Oakland Zoo. The East Bay Zoological Society is currently the Zoo operator pursuant to a management agreement with the City of Oakland.

Section 2.30.020. Oakland Zoo Special Tax.

A. A special tax in the amounts set forth below is hereby imposed on every parcel of real property within Alameda County.

B. The tax constitutes a debt owed by the Owner of each parcel to the County.

C. The County shall levy and collect the tax on each parcel of real property within Alameda County for which the Owner receives a separate ad valorem property tax bill, at the same time and manner, and subject to the same penalties and procedures as ad valorem property taxes collected by the County except as otherwise set forth in this ordinance.

D. Tax Rates.

1. The tax rates for each property type shall be as set forth in the table below. The Zoo operator shall be responsible for assigning a tax rate for each parcel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARCEL TYPE</th>
<th>ANNUAL TAX RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Residential</td>
<td>$12 per parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>$12 per parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidential</td>
<td>$72 per parcel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. If a parcel consists of both residential and nonresidential real property, the tax rate shall be the rate for nonresidential parcels.

3. The assessment roll data of the County Assessor as of January 1 of each year shall be used to determine the actual use of each parcel of real property for purposes of determining the tax hereunder.

E. Real property otherwise wholly exempted from ad valorem tax by state law shall also be exempted from any liability for the special tax imposed by this Chapter.

F. The uses of all parcels of real property shall be determined according to the assessment roll data of the Alameda County Tax Assessor. For parcels divided by Tax Rate Area lines, the payment for the portion of the parcel within Alameda County shall be calculated at the same rates as set forth above. For properties wholly within Alameda County and divided by Tax Rate Area lines into multiple parcels, the property shall be taxed as a single parcel at the rates set forth above.

G. Vacant and agricultural parcels shall be exempt from the special tax.

H. Pursuant to Article XIIIIB of the Constitution of the State of California and applicable laws, the appropriations limit for the County of Alameda is hereby increased by the aggregate sum authorized to be levied by this special tax for fiscal year 2013-14 and each year thereafter.

I. The County may establish rules that are necessary and desirable for implementation of this Chapter.

J. Single-family residential parcels shall be exempt from the applicable special tax if (1) they are owned and occupied by at least one person who is aged 67 years or older as of January 1 of the relevant tax year; (2) the combined family income of the owner from all sources for the previous calendar year is at or below the income level qualifying as “low income” for a family of such size under Section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, 42 U.S.C.A. Sections 1437 et seq. for each year; and (3) an application is filed for the exemption no later than May 1 annually. Exemption applications shall be filed with and processed by the Zoo operator or an administrator selected and retained by the Zoo operator, subject to the approval of the County.

K. The owner of an improved parcel that is unoccupied for at least six months of the year shall receive a refund of any tax paid, provided an application is filed no later than August 1 for the immediately preceding year for which a refund is sought. Refund applications shall be filed with and processed by the Zoo operator or an administrator selected and retained by the Zoo operator, subject to the approval of the County.

L. Any person claiming a refund of the special tax for any reason not provided herein shall first file a written claim, with the Zoo operator, or an administrator selected and retained by the Zoo operator, subject to the approval of the County. The Zoo operator or its retained administrator shall be responsible for processing and deciding all refund claims. Such claim must be filed no later than one year after the tax is imposed. All claims must be filed by the person who paid the tax or his or her guardian, conservator, or the executor of his or her estate. No claim may be filed on behalf of other taxpayers or a class of taxpayers. Filing of a claim shall be a condition precedent to legal action.
against the County for a refund of the tax.

Section 2.30.030. The Oakland Zoo Fund.
The “Oakland Zoo Fund” (“Fund”) is hereby created as a special revenue fund. Proceeds from the Oakland Zoo Special Tax, including penalties and interest earned on such proceeds, shall be deposited into the Fund for distribution pursuant to Section 2.30.050.

Section 2.30.040. Use of Oakland Zoo Special Tax Revenue.
A. Moneys in the Oakland Zoo Fund shall be used exclusively first, to pay for the costs of the election necessary to enact this Chapter, then: to pay for the services and projects of the Oakland Zoo, as defined in Section 2.30.010(H); to pay for all costs of administering this Chapter by the Zoo operator; and to reimburse the County as provided for in subdivision C of this Section. If this Chapter or the use of special tax funds is legally challenged, special tax funds may be used to reimburse the County and the Zoo operator for their costs of legal defense, including attorneys’ fees and other expenses.

B. Moneys in the Oakland Zoo Fund shall be distributed to the Zoo operator for the uses listed in subdivision A of this Section as they are deposited into the Fund, after deducting amounts necessary to reimburse the County, as provided for in subdivision C.

C. The County shall be reimbursed from the Fund for the costs it incurs in relation to the special tax as follows:

1. One and seven tenths percent (1.7%) of the special tax proceeds for collection of the special tax.
2. For actual costs associated with the administration of the Fund, including, but not limited to, disbursement of proceeds of the special tax.
3. For actual costs associated with monitoring and enforcing compliance with this Chapter, including, but not limited to, audit of uses and maintenance of use of the funds, and any expenses, including attorney’s fees, associated with any proceedings needed to enforce the requirements of this Chapter.
4. For actual costs, including attorneys’ fees, associated with litigation in defense of this Chapter or any other action that may be undertaken by the County to implement this Chapter or use funds provided by this special tax.

Section 2.30.050. Accountability.
In accordance with the requirements of California Government Code Sections 50075.1 and 50075.3, the following accountability measures, among others, shall apply to the special tax levied in accordance with this Chapter:

A. A separate, special account, referred to as the Oakland Zoo Fund, shall be created, as specified in Section 2.30.030, into which the proceeds of the special tax must be deposited.

B. The specific purposes of the special tax are for the funding of the Zoo’s services and projects as defined in Section 2.30.10(H) and for related election, administration, and legal fees as set forth in Section 2.30.040. The proceeds of the special tax shall be applied only to these specific purposes.

C. The Zoo operator shall comply with all of the following as conditions of receiving moneys from the Oakland Zoo Fund:

1. The Zoo operator shall retain an independent auditor annually to prepare a report that includes (a) the amounts collected and expended from the proceeds of the special tax and (b) the use of moneys received from the Oakland Zoo Fund to pay for services and projects authorized to be funded from the proceeds of the special tax.
2. The Zoo operator shall maintain the Zoo’s accreditation by the Association of Zoos and Aquariums, or its nationally recognized successor.
3. The Zoo operator shall hold harmless, defend and indemnify the County of Alameda, its Board of Supervisors, employees, officers, and agents from and against any and all claims, losses, damages, liabilities and expenses, including but not limited to attorneys’ fees, arising out of the administration of the Zoo special tax, the Oakland Zoo Fund, and this ordinance.

D. In the event that the East Bay Zoological Society ceases to operate the Oakland Zoo, the City of Oakland contracts with another entity for the operation of the Zoo, and the City intends to use special tax moneys to support Zoo operations, the City shall inform the County Administrator regarding the new operator selected prior to entering into a new management agreement. Any new management agreement shall be consistent with this Section 2.30.050. Compliance with this subdivision shall be a prerequisite to the successor operator being eligible to receive special tax moneys to support Zoo services and projects.

E. Oversight Committee. To ensure that the revenue from the special tax is spent responsibly and solely on the services and projects listed in Section 2.30.010(H) and for the other purposes listed in Section 2.30.040, an Oversight Committee shall be formed to perform the functions listed in this subsection. Members of the Oversight Committee shall be appointed annually.

1. Oversight Committee Formation and Qualifications.
   a. The Oversight Committee shall consist of the following:

   (1) Two Alameda County residents appointed by the President of the Board of Supervisors, one of whom shall represent the interests of taxpayers.
   (2) Two Alameda County residents appointed by the District 4 County Supervisor, one of whom shall represent the interests of seniors and the other of whom shall be a representative of a known conservation/environmental nonprofit organization.
   (3) Two City of Oakland residents appointed by the Mayor of the City of Oakland, one of whom shall be a public school teacher or a member of a public school parent-teacher association.
(4) One Alameda County resident appointed by the Alameda County Mayors Conference, who shall be a representative of the League of Women Voters.

(5) Two Alameda County residents appointed by the board of trustees of the Zoo operator, one of whom shall be a representative of the interests of animal rights.

b. Positions on the Oversight Committee shall be filled through an open application process. In addition to the requirements listed in subsection (a) above, members must be at least 18 years of age. Employees or officials of the City of Oakland or County of Alameda shall not serve as Oversight Committee members.

c. Upon their appointment and during their term of service, members of the Oversight Committee shall be and remain residents of Alameda County and/or the City of Oakland, depending upon which they were required to be at the time of appointment. Should a member cease to be a County or City resident, that seat shall become vacant and remain so until filled during the following annual appointment process. Supervisory and Mayoral appointees to the Oversight Committee shall serve at the pleasure of their appointers.

2. Oversight Committee Organization and Duties.

a. The Oversight Committee shall meet at least once annually on the day and time established by resolution of the board of trustees of the Zoo operator. A simple majority of members of the Oversight Committee who have been appointed shall constitute a quorum. The Oversight Committee may act by a simple majority of a quorum.

b. The Oversight Committee is charged with the following responsibilities: (i) reviewing the report prepared by the Zoo operator’s auditor pursuant to section 2.30.050(C)(1) to ensure that special tax revenue is spent solely on the services and projects listed in Section 2.30.010(H) and for the other purposes listed in Section 2.30.040; (ii) verifying that the Zoo remains accredited by the Association of Zoos and Aquariums; (iii) verifying that the Zoo operator and the County of Alameda have executed a valid indemnification agreement meeting the requirements of Section 2.30.050.C.3; and (iv) confirming (i), (ii), and (iii) in writing to the Board of Supervisors.

c. The Oversight Committee’s written confirmation prepared pursuant to subdivision b above shall be forwarded to the Zoo operator and to the County Administrator. The presentation of that report by the Zoo operator to the Board of Supervisors shall satisfy the requirements of Government Code section 50075.3.

F. If the Board of Supervisors determines that the Oakland Zoo has used, or is currently using, moneys from the Oakland Zoo Fund in a manner that is not consistent with the uses specified in Sections 2.30.020(H), then the Board of Supervisors may suspend disbursements from the Fund. Suspension of disbursements may continue until the Zoo operator spends funds from other sources on services and projects at an amount equal to the amount determined to have been misspent. A determination of misspending shall be based upon a report prepared by an independent auditor retained by the County, taking into consideration the findings of the Oversight Committee.

The County’s reasonable costs of investigating misspending may be reimbursed from the Fund.

G. If the Oakland Zoo ceases to operate, the special tax shall terminate automatically. The special tax shall continue if the City of Oakland conveys the Zoo and its assets to another public agency. That public agency shall be required to satisfy all of the Zoo operator’s requirements under this Chapter to continue to receive moneys from the Fund. In the event that the City conveys some of the Zoo assets to the Zoo operator, the tax shall continue. If the City conveys the Zoo property and all of the Zoo assets to a nonprofit corporation, continued use of the special tax to support the Zoo’s operations shall be contingent upon that nonprofit corporation executing a separate agreement with the County relating to the operation of this ordinance.

Section 2.30.060. Severability.

A. If any provision of this Chapter is held by any court or by any Federal or State agency of competent jurisdiction, to be invalid as conflicting with any Federal or State law, rule or regulation now or hereafter in effect, or is held by such court or agency to be modified in any way in order to conform to the requirements of any such law, rule or regulation, such provision shall be considered a separate, distinct, and independent part of this ordinance, and such holding shall not affect the validity and enforceability of all other provisions hereof. In the event that such law, rule or regulation is subsequently repealed, rescinded, amended or otherwise changed, so that the provision thereof which had previously been held invalid or modified is no longer in conflict with such law, rule or regulation, said provision shall thereupon return to full force and effect and shall thereafter be binding.

B. If any section, subsection, phrase, clause, sentence, or word in this ordinance shall for any reason be held invalid or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, it shall not nullify the remainder of this ordinance but shall be confined to the article, section, subsection, subdivision, clause, sentence or word so held invalid or unconstitutional.

Section 2.30.070. Amendment.

This Chapter may only be amended by a vote of the people if the amendment would result in the special tax being imposed, extended, or increased in a manner not authorized by this Chapter as originally approved by the voters. The Board of Supervisors may enact other amendments, including but not limited to amendments necessary to assist the Oakland Zoo in obtaining long-term financing for services and projects.

Section 2.30.080. Expiration of Tax.

This chapter shall remain in effect only until December 31, 2037, and as of that date is repealed unless a later ordinance is adopted and approved by the voters prior to December 31, 2037 that either deletes or extends that date.

SECTION II

This Chapter, and all the provisions thereof, shall become
Effective only upon affirmative passage by a two-thirds majority vote of the eligible voters of this County pursuant to California Constitution, Article XIII A, section 4 and Article XIII C, section 2; California Government Code 53722; and Elections Code section 9140.

**OAKLAND ZOO MEASURE A1 EXPENDITURE PLAN**

After receiving feedback from residents throughout Alameda County on their priorities for the Oakland Zoo, the Board of Trustees of the East Bay Zoological Society has determined that the community places a high priority on the Oakland Zoo maintaining the ability to care for and meet the basic needs of the Zoo’s animals, including providing food, heating/cooling, clean and fresh watering systems, and repairing and maintaining aging animal shelters. In addition, one of the essential missions of the Oakland Zoo is to educate children about wildlife and nature, and in today’s tough economy, residents believe we must protect and maintain affordable, accessible Zoo educational programs for children and youth from throughout Alameda County. After carefully reviewing the needs, the following projects and programs were deemed to be essential community priorities, and are proposed to be addressed with the proceeds from Measure A1.

| OAKLAND ZOO HUMANE ANIMAL CARE/EDUCATION PROTECTION MEASURE EXPENDITURE PLAN |
|------------------|------------------|
| **QUALITY HUMANE ANIMAL CARE AND BASIC ANIMAL NEEDS** |
| As sufficient funds are available, in conjunction with other future funding/revenue sources, funds will be used to care for and meet the basic needs of Zoo animals, ensure animals are safe and enclosures are well maintained, and make repairs, improvements and seismic upgrades to sewage, drainage, plumbing, lighting and electrical systems, some of which are over 40 years old, in order to provide quality, humane animal care and conditions: |
| **Serving Basic Animal Needs and Care** |
| • Provide food and clean, fresh watering systems to meet the basic needs of Zoo animals, including upgrading water filtration systems for elephant pool, giraffe exhibit, and gibbon island. |
| • Install/upgrade heating and cooling systems for Zoo animals (including giraffe barn/tiger night house) to ensure quality, humane animal care. |
| • Maintain the veterinary hospital and skilled animal healthcare providers to ensure essential medical care for sick and aging animals, including partnering with UC Davis School of Veterinary Medicine. |

- Maintain, upgrade and repair animal enclosures for safety and to ensure more natural and humane conditions such as upgrading the elephant barn, climbing structure for gibbons, and immersion pool for hyenas; creating larger, more naturalistic tiger/chimpanzee exhibits, and repairing aging animal shelters such as leaking reptile exhibits and animal holding for education animals.
- Repair, upgrade and add animal exhibits to meet the basic needs and safety of animals, including reopening two exhibits currently closed.
- Improve training for employees and volunteers to ensure quality, humane care of animals.
- Repair or replace animal maintenance equipment to better serve basic animal needs.

**Wildlife Conservation and Animal Rescue**

- Protect vulnerable wildlife by maintaining partner programs with wildlife conservation and animal rescue organizations to provide care for animals wounded in the wild and give sanctuary to endangered species and retired circus animals.
- Improve conservation by maintaining and expanding “In the Wild” program.
- Improve conservation research and develop conservation center and programming to educate zoo visitors about animal conservation efforts.

**Repairs and Seismic Upgrades for Safety**

- Repair aging sewer/drainage systems in animal enclosures that are decades old and need seismic upgrades, including replacing/upgrading deteriorated primary storm drain system.
- Improve old and outdated lighting and electrical systems for energy efficiency and safety.
- Perform critical maintenance throughout the zoo.

**EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND ZOO ACCESSIBILITY/AFFORDABILITY**

As sufficient funds are available, money will be used to support and maintain the Zoo’s children and youth educational programs/field trips and keep entrance fees affordable.

**Educational Children’s Programing and School Field Trips**

- Double the number of school children served by the Zoo at a time local schools are cutting science programs and field trips.
- Maintain educational programs for Alameda County children who are already underserved by budget cuts in Alameda County public schools.
- Continue to offer school field trips and provide needed transportation to the Zoo for school children from every Alameda County Supervisorial District.
- Provide important science and nature education classes for children who often have none in public schools.
• Support Animals for Education program to educate children about wildlife and nature in a way not possible through books by adding animal holding space to increase number of animals used in outreach program traveling to Alameda County schools.

**Maintaining Affordability and Visitor Safety**

• Keep programs, entrance fees and access affordable for children/youth and all Zoo visitors

• Ensure visitor safety with measures such as safety lighting, security cameras, and improving signage and walkways.

**MISCELLANEOUS**

The above projects and programs are examples of priorities that have been identified by the community as important needs for improving the Zoo. Projects are not listed in priority order and may be enhanced, supplemented or expanded to the extent funds are available and funding allocations may be updated to accommodate changing needs. To maintain consistency with the purposes of Measure A1, including as expressed in this Expenditure Plan, the Zoo may delete a project or service among the examples listed in this Expenditure Plan, may substitute unidentified but similar projects and services for those listed, and may decide the order in which projects and services are initiated and completed, as long as expenditures of revenue from Measure A1 are consistent with the general categories of projects listed in this Expenditure Plan. Because the tax authorized by Measure A1 will be in effect after projects and services listed in this Expenditure Plan are completed or become less responsive to community need, the Zoo may undertake new projects and services consistent with the general purposes listed in this Expenditure Plan.
COUNTY COUNSEL’S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE B1

ANALYSIS BY THE COUNTY COUNSEL OF AN ALAMEDA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION SALES TAX MEASURE

This measure seeks voter approval of an ordinance that provides for the following three items: (1) an extension in perpetuity of the existing one-half of one percent (0.5%) transactions and use tax for transportation purposes, currently set to expire in March of 2022; (2) an increase to the transactions and use tax by one-half of one percent (0.5%) resulting in a total tax of one percent (1%); and (3) the Alameda County Transportation Commission’s (“Commission”) authority to issue limited tax bonds.

The Alameda County Congestion Management Agency and the Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority merged to create the Commission in July of 2010. The Commission has the authority to increase the transactions and use tax upon approval by two-thirds of the votes cast under the terms of the measure and California Public Utilities Code section 180201.

The Commission shall not have outstanding at any one time limited tax bonds in excess of one billion dollars.

The measure creates the Independent Watchdog Committee (“Committee”). The Committee will review and oversee all expenditures of the tax proceeds and report directly to the public. The Committee’s annual report will include information on spending and the progress made in implementing the Plan. The expenditures are also subject to annual independent audits.

If two-thirds of the qualified electors voting on this measure do not vote for approval, the measure will fail, and the Commission will not be authorized to extend and increase the tax outlined above.

s/DONNA R. ZIEGLER
County Counsel

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure B1, which is printed in full in this sample ballot pamphlet. If you desire an additional copy of the measure, please call the Elections Official’s office at (510) 272-6933 and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you. You may also access the full text of the measure on the Alameda County website at the following address: www.acgov.org/rov/.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE B1

Measure B1 was first approved by Alameda County voters in 1986 and provides funds for critically needed transportation projects in Alameda County to reduce traffic congestion and improve public transportation. These projects include road maintenance and safety projects, earthquake safety retrofits for overpasses, bridges and elevated freeways, improvements to BART and AC Transit and insures that transit fares are kept affordable for seniors, disabled and youth.

Alameda County residents need reliable and efficient transportation options for a better quality of life, stronger economy, and cleaner environment. The continuation and extension of this measure will allow critical transportation projects to move ahead uninterrupted.

Measure B1 is a comprehensive plan to address critical transportation needs in every community in Alameda County. It will provide funds to maintain our roads and transit systems, improve traffic flow and highway safety, ensure public transportation is available and affordable to everyone, and make it safer and easier to bike and walk throughout the county.

Passage of Measure B1 will also help Alameda County qualify for state and federal matching transportation grants. Every penny raised by Measure B1 stays in Alameda County to improve transportation systems. It will support our local economy by creating thousands of much-needed local jobs.

A public oversight committee will ensure all funding is spent according to the plan. Measure B1 is a secure, local, and reliable source of funds for critical transportation projects in our community. No money can be taken away by the state or used for other purposes.

You can read more about the plan at www.YesonB1.com.

Every city in Alameda County has voted in support of this plan. Please join us in voting YES on Measure B1 and continue critical transportation funding for Alameda County.

s/Robert A. Wieckowski
Member, Assembly Committee on Job Creation for the New Economy

s/Scott Haggerty
Commissioner, Metropolitan Transportation Commission

s/Nate Miley
Alameda County Supervisor

s/Sheila Jordan
Superintendent, Alameda County Office of Education

s/Arthur L. Dao
Executive Director, Alameda County Transportation Commission

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE B1

These are NOT New Plans: They are already in MTC, OneBayArea and other Regional Plans for Alameda County, Including many “EXTENSIVE NEW BIKE LANES”.

Proponents neglected to say:

- B 1 DOUBLES the existing Sales Tax.
- Adds $1,000,000,000 (Billion) in Revolving Bond Debts (Reauthorized “forever” when spent down - NO Limit).
- Adds a new “Storage” Tax (Hitting employers and individuals who store goods for sale)
- ALL NEW TAXES are “FOREVER TAXES” (Deliberately set without a “sunset clause”).

A MASSIVE TAX INCREASE: Disproportionately harming working families. (A greater percentage of their income goes to sales taxes.)

Flawed public policy. Developers get rich on the backs of ordinary people by building lucrative apartment buildings. These trap lower-income residents into poverty cycles with jobs limited to those accessible by public transit. Our children get trapped in low-performing or failing public schools.

- Adding massive new taxes to struggling small businesses, lower-income and middle classes.
- HARMS OUR DEPRESSED ECONOMY AND DRIVES MORE EMPLOYERS OUT OF ALAMEDA COUNTY.

Limiting Our Mobility: (low-income today: How most Americans start out and very often escape)

- It will be harder for many of us and our children to get ahead. Access to higher-paying jobs and benefits will be blocked. (Brookings Institute.)
- IN AMERICA – ESCAPING POVERTY IS POSSIBLE – Measure B 1 blocks that ability.

- Middle-class families also set back: FORCED INTO PUBLIC TANSIT ONLY – CAREER and SCHOOL OPTIONS are SHUT DOWN.

DON’T PAY MORE TO HAVE YOUR OPTIONS REDUCED

Measure B 1 is coming to your town
VOTE NO TO STOP IT
www.VoteNoMeasureB1.com

s/Al Phillips
Candidate Assembly District 16

s/Christopher J. Pareja
Business Owner and June 2012 Independent Candidate

s/Mimi Steel
SF Bay CAPR, President
ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE B1
Alameda County Transportation Expenditure Plan Sales Tax

This measure increases taxes on all income levels. It puts control of transportation decisions in the hands of Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC) who will use their taxing authority and resources to fund inefficient, expensive, and underutilized public transportation systems at the expense of automobile drivers.

Car use under this plan will be discouraged because it competes with public transportation. Increasing the costs of driving is intended to reduce the number of people who can afford to own and drive a car, forcing many to use public transportation.

ACTC will have the power to force citizens to assume responsibility for up to $1B in bond debt which will ultimately lead to requests for higher sales taxes and parcel taxes. Many residents would pay more than a 10% sales tax on everything they buy, a percentage that will only increase over time.

Cities are being coerced into developing high density housing in mixed use developments near transit centers. Cities that do not comply could lose Measure B dollars yet their citizens will still be paying the sales tax.

“These proposed funds would be distributed periodically by the Alameda CTC to eligible agencies within Alameda County” 2012 Alameda County Transportation Expenditure Plan

Who are these agencies? Why should ATC be given a blank check written at taxpayer expense to disburse funds to undetermined “agencies”

The Alameda County GRAND JURY just cited the county for “lack of oversight on the expenditure of funds” (CC Times, June 27, 2012)

How can citizens trust that funds will be spent wisely? Vote NO

s/Estes Albert Phillips
s/Christopher J. Pareja
s/Mary B. Steel
President SF Bay CAPR

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE B1

The opponents of Measure B1 are members of an ultra conservative fringe group who either make up facts or are misinformed.

Here are the facts.

Measure B has been in effect for 26 years. Measure B funds support projects throughout Alameda County including improvements to ALL transportation systems, roads, street repairs, BART, local bus systems (including AC Transit) and earthquake safety repairs of old overpasses and bridges.

Most importantly Measure B1 provides funding so that transit fares for seniors and the disabled are kept affordable and that students are provided low cost transit passes to get to school.

Every single city in Alameda County has voted to support this plan. In fact, every city participated in the development of the plan to identify critical projects important to each local community. Measure B1 will address the continuing transportation needs of Alameda County residents and businesses including reducing traffic congestion and improving air quality.

Measure B1 keeps our sales tax dollars in Alameda County. No money can be taken by the state or used for other purposes. An independent oversight committee has been established to provide audits and to ensure all funds are spent properly.

A YES vote on Measure B1 will fund critical local projects like road repair, BART improvements, passenger rail improvements and Safe Routes for Schools. It will support our local economy by creating thousands of much-needed jobs right here in Alameda County.

Please vote Yes on B1 to keep our sales tax dollars in Alameda County.

s/Scott Haggerty
Alameda County Supervisor
s/Sheila Jordan
Alameda County Superintendent of Schools
s/Nate Miley
County Supervisor
s/Bob Wieckowski
Assembly Member
s/Arthur L. Dao
Executive Director
FULL TEXT OF MEASURE B1

ORDINANCE NO. 2012-1

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR AN EXTENSION OF AN EXISTING ONE-HALF OF ONE PERCENT TRANSACTIONS AND USE TAX BEYOND MARCH 31, 2022, AND IMPOSITION OF AN ADDITIONAL ONE-HALF OF ONE PERCENT TRANSACTIONS AND USE TAX BY THE ALAMEDA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION FOR TRANSPORTATION PURPOSES, FOR THE ISSUANCE OF LIMITED TAX BONDS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The Governing Body of the Alameda County Transportation Commission ("Alameda CTC") does ordain as follows:

ARTICLE I
General

Section 1. Title
This ordinance shall be known as the “Alameda County Transportation Commission Transaction and Use Tax Ordinance” and may also be referenced as the “Ordinance” herein. This ordinance shall be applicable in the incorporated and unincorporated territory of the County of Alameda.

Section 2. Period of Tax
This Ordinance is intended to extend the imposition and collection in Alameda County of an existing one-half of one percent transactions and use tax for transportation purposes, which will expire as of March 31, 2022, and impose an additional transaction and use tax by one-half of one percent, resulting in a total tax of one percent without any sunset, unless otherwise terminated by the voters of Alameda County. The additional one-half of one percent tax authorized by this ordinance shall be imposed beginning at the close of polls on the day of the election at which the measure is adopted by two-thirds vote of the electors voting on the measure or as soon thereafter as the tax may be lawfully imposed.

Section 3. Purpose
Alameda CTC is the result of a merger of the Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority, which formerly administered the existing half-cent transaction and use tax, and the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency, which was formerly responsible for long-range planning and programming of transportation funds. Pursuant to Division 19 of the Public Utilities Code (commencing with Section 180000), Alameda CTC, the Board of Supervisors and the cities of Alameda, Albany, Berkeley, Dublin, Emeryville, Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, Newark, Oakland, Piedmont, Pleasanton, San Leandro and Union City have approved the 2012 Transportation Expenditure Plan adopted by the Alameda CTC Governing Body and have recommended that a measure be submitted to the voters of the County for their endorsement which would, if passed, authorize Alameda CTC to extend an existing one-half of one percent transactions and use tax scheduled to sunset in 2022 and increase the tax by one-half of one percent without sunset, unless otherwise terminated by the voters of Alameda County, and authorize Alameda CTC to issue limited tax bonds to finance the transportation improvements set forth in the 2012 Transportation Expenditure Plan.

The purposes of this ordinance are as follows:

a) To impose a retail transactions and use tax in accordance with the provisions of Part 1.6 (commencing with Revenue and Taxation Code Section 7251) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code and Division 19 of the Public Utilities Code which directs the County Board of Supervisors to place the tax ordinance on the ballot for voter approval, exercising the taxing power granted to the Alameda CTC pursuant to Public Utilities Code Division 19.

b) To adopt a retail transactions and use tax ordinance which incorporates provisions identical to those of the Sales and Use Tax Law of the State of California insofar as those provisions are not inconsistent with the requirements and limitations contained in Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

c) To adopt a retail transactions and use tax ordinance which imposes a tax and provides a measure therefor that can be administered and collected by the State Board of Equalization in a manner that adapts itself as fully as practicable to, and requires the least possible deviation from the existing statutory and administrative procedures followed by the State Board of Equalization in administering and collecting the California State Sales and Use Taxes.

d) To adopt a retail transactions and use tax ordinance which can be administered in a manner that will be, to the greatest degree possible, consistent with the provisions of Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, minimize the cost of collecting the transactions and use taxes and at the same time minimize the burden of record keeping upon persons subject to taxation under the provisions of this ordinance.

e) To improve, construct, maintain, and operate certain transportation projects and facilities contained in the 2012 Transportation Expenditure Plan, which Plan is incorporated here by this reference as though fully set forth herein, and as that Plan may be amended from time to time pursuant to applicable law and as provided in the 2012 Transportation Expenditure Plan. Any amendment must be adopted by a two-thirds vote of the Alameda CTC Governing Body. All jurisdictions within the county will be given a minimum of 45 days to comment on any proposed Transportation Expenditure Plan amendment.

f) To set a term for an unlimited period, unless otherwise terminated by the voters of Alameda County, during which time this tax shall be imposed pursuant to the authority granted by Division 19 of the Public Utilities Code.

g) To provide for the ability of Alameda County voters to directly endorse comprehensive updates to the
2012 Transportation Expenditure Plan no later than the last general election date prior to June 2042 and then every twenty years thereafter, as specified in the 2012 Transportation Expenditure Plan. The Alameda CTC Governing Body will engage in an inclusionary deliberative process to adopt any comprehensive updates, and require a two-thirds vote of the Alameda CTC Governing Body for recommended adoption. The comprehensive update will be then be reviewed by the fourteen Alameda County cities and the County of Alameda, and Alameda CTC shall thereafter place a ballot measure on a general election ballot offering the comprehensive update for approval by a majority vote of the people. If the voters do not approve the comprehensive update, Alameda CTC shall prepare a revised comprehensive update under the inclusionary deliberative process described above and submit it to the voters as soon as practicable. The tax shall continue to be imposed and Alameda CTC may continue to make expenditures pursuant to the then existing Transportation Expenditure Plan, but may not add new projects or programs through the amendment process until a revised comprehensive update is approved by the voters of Alameda County by majority vote.

Section 4. Contract with State.

Prior to the operative date, Alameda CTC shall contract with the State Board of Equalization to perform all functions incident to the administration and operation of this transactions and use tax ordinance; provided that, if Alameda CTC shall not have contracted with the State Board of Equalization prior to the operative date, it shall nevertheless so contract and in such a case the operative date shall be the first day of the first calendar quarter following the execution of such a contract.

Section 5. Transactions Tax Rate of An Additional One-Half Percent and Extension of the Existing Tax Rate of One-Half Percent.

For the privilege of selling tangible personal property at retail, a tax is hereby imposed upon all retailers in this County at the rate of an additional one-half of one percent, which tax shall be imposed concurrently with the existing one-half percent tax, of the gross receipts of any retailer from the sale of all tangible personal property sold at retail in this County on and after the operative date. This tax shall be imposed for an unlimited period, unless otherwise terminated by the voters of Alameda County, as described in Section 2 herein. The existing one-half percent use tax originally imposed by ACTIA and now administered by Alameda CTC shall be extended and shall be imposed for an unlimited period, unless otherwise terminated by the voters of Alameda County, as described in Section 2 herein.

Section 6. Place of Sale.

For the purposes of this ordinance, all retail sales are consummated at the place of business of the retailer unless the tangible personal property sold is delivered by the retailer or his agent to an out of state destination or to a common carrier for delivery to an out-of-state destination.

The gross receipts from such sales shall include delivery charges, when such charges are subject to the state sales and use tax, regardless of the place to which delivery is made. In the event a retailer has no permanent place of business in the State or has more than one place of business, the place or places at which the retail sales are consummated shall be determined under rules and regulations to be prescribed and adopted by the State Board of Equalization.

Section 7. Use Tax Rate of An Additional One-Half Percent and Extension of the Current Use Tax Rate of One-Half Percent.

An excise tax is hereby imposed on the storage, use or other consumption in this County of tangible personal property purchased from any retailer on and after the operative tax date for storage, use or other consumption in this County at the rate of an additional one-half of one percent, which tax shall be imposed concurrently with the existing one-half percent tax. The sales price shall include delivery charges when such charges are subject to state sales or use tax regardless of the place to which delivery is made. This tax shall be imposed for an unlimited period, unless otherwise terminated by the voters of Alameda County, as described in Section 2 herein. The existing one-half percent use tax originally imposed by ACTIA and now administered by Alameda CTC shall be extended and shall be imposed for an unlimited period, unless otherwise terminated by the voters of Alameda County, as described in Section 2 herein.

Section 8. Adoption of Provisions of State Law.

Except as otherwise provided in this ordinance and except insofar as they are inconsistent with the provisions of Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code (commencing with Section 6001), all of the provisions of Part 1 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code are hereby adopted and made a part of this ordinance as though fully set forth herein.

Section 9. Limitations on Adoption of State Law and Collection of Use Taxes.

In adopting the provisions of Part I of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code:

(a) Wherever the State of California is named or referred to as the taxing agency, the name of Alameda CTC shall be substituted therefor. The substitution, however, shall not be made when:

(i) The word State is used as part of the title of the State Controller, State Treasurer, State Board of Control, State Board of Equalization, State Treasury, or the Constitution of the State of California;

(ii) The substitution would require action to be taken by or against Alameda CTC or any agency, officer or employee thereof rather than by or against the State Board of Equalization, in performing the functions incident to the administration or operation of this Ordinance;

(iii) In those sections, including, but not necessarily limited to, sections referring to the exterior boundaries of the State of California, where the result of the substitution would be to:
(1) Provide an exemption from this tax with respect to certain sales, storage, use or other consumption of tangible personal property which would not otherwise be exempt from this tax while such sales, storage, use or other consumption remain subject to tax by the State under the provisions of Part 1 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, or;

(2) Impose this tax with respect to certain sales, storage, use or other consumption of tangible personal property which would not be subject to tax by the state under the said provision of that code.

(iv) In sections 6701, 6702, (except in the last sentence thereof), 6711, 6715, 6737, 6797 or 6828 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

(a) The name of the County shall be substituted for the word “State” in the phrase “retailer engaged in business in this State” in Section 6203 and in the definition of that phrase in Section 6203.

Section 10. Permit Not Required.

If a seller’s permit has been issued to a retailer under Section 6067 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, an additional transactor’s permit shall not be required by this ordinance.

Section 11. Exemptions, Exclusions and Credits.

a) There shall be excluded from the measure of the transactions tax and the use tax the amount of any sales tax or use tax imposed by the State of California or by any city, city and county, or county pursuant to the Bradley-Burns Uniform Local Sales and Use Tax Law or the amount of any state-administered transactions or use tax.

b) There are exempted from the computation of the amount of transactions tax the gross receipts from:

1) Sales of tangible personal property, other than fuel or petroleum products, to operators of aircraft to be used or consumed principally outside Alameda County and directly and exclusively in the use of such aircraft as common carriers of persons or property under the authority of the laws of this State, the United States, or any foreign government.

2) Sales of property to be used outside the County which is shipped to a point outside the County, pursuant to the contract of sale, by delivery to such point by the retailer or his agent, or by delivery by the retailer to a carrier for shipment to a consignee at such point. For the purposes of this paragraph, delivery to a point outside the County shall be satisfied:

(i) with respect to vehicles (other than commercial vehicles) subject to registration pursuant to Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 4000) of Division 3 of the Vehicle Code, aircraft licensed in compliance with Section 21411 of the Public Utilities Code, and undocumented vessels registered under Division 3.5 (commencing with Section 9840 of the Vehicle Code, by registration to an out-of-County address and by a declaration under penalty of perjury, signed by the buyer, stating that such address is, in fact, his or her principal place of residence; and

(ii) with respect to commercial vehicles by registration to a place of business out-of-county, and a declaration under penalty of perjury, signed by the buyer, that the vehicle will be operated from that address.

3) The sale of tangible personal property if the seller is obligated to furnish the property for a fixed price pursuant to a contract entered into prior to the operative date of this ordinance.

4) A lease of tangible personal property which is a continuing sale of such property for any period of time for which the lessor is obligated to lease the property for an amount fixed by the lease prior to the operative date of this ordinance.

5) For the purposes of subsections (3) and (4), the sale or lease of tangible personal property shall be deemed not to be obligated pursuant to a contract or lease for any period of time for which any party to the contract or lease has the unconditional right to terminate the contract or lease upon notice, whether or not such right is exercised.

c) There are exempted from the use tax imposed by this ordinance the storage, use or other consumption in this County of tangible personal property:

1) The gross receipts from the sale of which have been subject to a transactions tax under any state-administered transactions and use tax ordinance.

2) Other than fuel or petroleum products, purchased by operators of aircraft and used or consumed by such operators directly and exclusively in the use of such aircraft as common carriers of persons or property for hire or compensation under a certificate of public convenience and necessity issued pursuant to the laws of this State, the United States, or any foreign government. This exemption is in addition to the exemptions provided in Sections 6366 and 6366.1 of the Revenue and Taxation Code of the State of California.

3) If the purchaser is obligated to purchase the property for a fixed price pursuant to a contract entered into prior to the operative date of this ordinance.

4) If the possession of, or the exercise of any right or power over, the tangible personal property arises under a lease which is a continuing purchase of such property for any period of time for which the lessee is obligated to lease the property for an amount fixed by a lease prior to the operative date of this ordinance.

5) For the purposes of subsections (3) and (4), storage, use or other consumption, or possession, or exercise of any right or power over, tangible personal property shall be deemed not to be obligated pursuant to a contract or lease for any period of time for which any party to the contract or lease has the unconditional right to terminate the contract or lease upon notice, whether or not such right is exercised.

6) Except as provided in subparagraph (7), a retailer engaged in business in the County shall not be required to collect use tax from the purchaser of tangible personal property, unless the retailer ships or delivers the property into the County or participates within the County
in making the sale of the property, including, but not limited to, soliciting or receiving the order, either directly or indirectly, at a place of business of the retailer in the County or through any representative, agent, canvasser, solicitor, subsidiary, or person in the County under the authority of the retailer.

7) “A retailer engaged in business in the County” shall also include any retailer of any of the following: vehicles subject to registration pursuant to Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 4000) of Division 3 of the Vehicle Code, aircraft licensed in compliance with Section 21411 of the Public Utilities Code, or undocumented vehicles registered under Division 3.5 (commencing with Section 9840) of the Vehicle Code. That retailer shall be required to collect use tax from any purchaser who registers or licenses the vehicle, vessel, or aircraft at an address in the County.

d) Any person subject to use tax under this ordinance may credit against that tax any transactions tax or reimbursement for transactions tax paid to a district imposing, or retailer liable for, a transactions tax pursuant to Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code with respect to the sale to the person of the property the storage, use or other consumption of which is subject to the use tax.

Section 12. Propositions.

There shall be proposed to the voters of Alameda County the following proposition:

“Shall a new Transportation Expenditure Plan be implemented to address current and future transportation needs that:

• Improves transit access to jobs and schools;
• Fixes roads, improves highways and increases bicycle and pedestrian safety;
• Reduces traffic congestion and improves air quality;
• Keeps senior, youth, and disabled fares affordable

Approval extends the existing County sales tax and increases it by 1/2 cent, with independent oversight, local job creation programs. No money can be taken by the state.”

Section 13. Limitation on Issuance of Bonds.

Unless approved by the Alameda CTC Governing Body and by the voters, Alameda CTC shall not have outstanding at any one time in excess of $1,000,000,000 in limited tax bonds.

Section 14. Use of Proceeds.

The proceeds of the additional one-half of one percent transaction and use tax imposed by this ordinance, and the proceeds from the extension of the existing one-half of one percent transaction and use tax authorized by this ordinance beyond March 31, 2022, shall together be used solely for the projects and purposes set forth in the 2012 Transportation Expenditure Plan, as it may be amended from time to time, and for the administration thereof.

Section 15. Appropriations Limit.

For purposes of Article XIIIB of the State Constitution, the appropriations limit for Alameda CTC for fiscal year 2012-2013, including activities, projects and programs funded by the transaction and tax authorized hereby along with activities, projects and programs funded by other local, state and federal funds, shall be $800,000,000, and thereafter that amount should be amended pursuant to applicable law.

Section 16. Amendments.

All amendments subsequent to the effective date of this ordinance to Part I of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code relating to sales and use taxes and which are not inconsistent with Part 1.6 and Part 1.7 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, and all amendments to Part 1.6 and Part 1.7 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, shall automatically become a part of this ordinance; provided, however, that no such amendment shall operate so as to affect the rate of tax imposed by this ordinance.

Section 17. Enjoining Collection Forbidden

Any action or proceedings in any court questioning the validity of the adoption of this transactions and use tax ordinance or issuance of any bonds thereunder or any proceeding related thereto shall commence within six months from the date of the election at which this ordinance is approved. Otherwise, the bonds and all proceedings related thereto, including the adoption and approval of this ordinance, shall be held valid and in every respect legal and incontestable.

No injunction or writ of mandate or other legal or equitable process shall issue in any suit, action or proceeding in any court against the State or Alameda CTC, or against any officer of the State or Alameda CTC, to prevent or enjoin the collection under this ordinance, or Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, of any tax or any amount of tax required to be collected.

Section 18. Severability.

If any provision of this ordinance or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the ordinance and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Section 19. Effective Date.

This ordinance relates, in substantial part, to the continuation and expansion of the authority for Alameda CTC to levy and collect the transactions and use taxes to support the 2012 Transportation Expenditure Plan and shall take effect at the close of the polls on the day of election at which the proposition is adopted by two-thirds vote of the electors voting on the measure, or as soon thereafter as the tax may be lawfully imposed.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Members of the Alameda County Transportation Commission on May 24, 2012 by the following vote*:
AYES: 23 (Harper, Haggerty, Piexoto, Gregory, Miley, Carson, Blalock, Bonta, Javandel, Capitelli, Atkin, Chan, Henson, Marchand, Freitas,
BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY

FULFILLING THE PROMISE TO VOTERS
In November 2000, Alameda County voters approved Measure B, a half-cent local transportation sales tax, scheduled to sunset in 2022. Virtually all of the major projects promised to and approved by the voters in that measure are either underway or complete. Funds that go to cities and other local jurisdictions to maintain and improve local streets, provide critical transit service and services for seniors and persons with disabilities, as well as bicycle and pedestrian safety projects will continue until the current Measure B expenditure plan ends in 2022. Through careful management, leveraging of other funding opportunities and consensus-based planning, the promises of the 2000 voter-approved measure have been largely fulfilled and essential operations are on-going.

While most of the projects promised in Measure B have been implemented or are underway, the need to continue to maintain and improve the County’s transportation system remains critically important. Alameda County continues to grow, while funding from outside sources has been cut or has not kept pace. Unless the County acts now to increase local resources for transportation, by 2035, when Alameda County’s population is expected to be 24% higher than today, it is anticipated that vehicle miles traveled will increase by 40%:

- Average morning rush hour speeds on the county’s freeways will fall by 10%
- Local roads will continue to deteriorate
- Local transit systems will continue to face service cuts and fare increase, and
- Biking and walking routes, which are critical to almost every trip, will continue to deteriorate, impacting safety, public health and the environment.

This Alameda County Transportation Expenditure Plan (referred to throughout this document as the TEP or the plan) responds to the county’s continued transportation needs through the extension and augmentation of a consistent, locally generated and protected funding stream to address the County’s transportation needs. A key feature of the local transportation sales tax is that it cannot be used for any purpose other than local transportation needs. It cannot be taken by the State or by any other governmental agency under any circumstance, and over the life of this plan can only be used for the purposes described in the plan, or as amended.

The ballot measure supported by this plan augments and extends the existing half-cent sales tax for transportation in Alameda County known as Measure B, authorizing an additional half-cent sales tax through 2022 and extending the full cent in perpetuity. Recognizing that transportation needs, technology, and circumstances change over time, this expenditure plan covers the period from approval in 2012 for an unlimited period unless otherwise terminated by the voters, programming a total of $7.7 billion in new transportation funding in the first thirty years. Voters will have the opportunity to review and approve comprehensive updates to this plan at least once prior to the end of 2042 and every 20 years thereafter.

The expenditure plan funds critical improvements to the county’s transit network, including expanding transit operations and restoring service cuts and expanding the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) system within Alameda County, to move more people on transit. It expands transportation services for seniors and people with disabilities, responding to the needs of an aging population. The plan also funds projects to relieve congestion throughout the county, moving people and goods more efficiently, by supporting strategic investments on I-80, I-580, I-680, I-880, and State Routes 84 and 262. In addition, the plan recognizes growth in bicycle and pedestrian travel by completing major trails and bikeways and making substantial improvements in pedestrian safety and access.

STATUS OF THE CURRENT MEASURE B EXPENDITURE PLAN

Voters in Alameda County have long recognized the need to provide stable and local funding for the County’s transportation needs. In 1986, Alameda County voters authorized a half-cent transportation sales tax to finance improvements to the county’s overburdened transportation infrastructure. An even wider margin of voters reauthorized this tax in 2000, with over 81.5% support. Detailed expenditure plans have guided the use of these funds. The current plan provides over $100 million each year for essential operations, maintenance and construction of transportation projects. It authorized the expenditure of funds for the extension of BART to Warm Springs, transit operations, rapid bus improvements throughout the county, bicycle and pedestrian trails and bridges, a countywide Safe Routes to School Program, and specialized transportation services for seniors and people with disabilities. It has also provided congestion relief throughout Alameda County by widening I-238, constructing the I-680 express lane, improving I-580 and I-880, and upgrading surface streets and arterial roadways.

Most of the 27 major projects authorized by the current expenditure plan have been completed or are under construction, many ahead of schedule. Annual audits by independent certified public accountants have verified that 100% of the public funds authorized in the current plan have been spent as promised.

The current projects and programs are governed by the...
current Measure B Expenditure Plan.

**BENEFITS FROM THE CURRENT MEASURE B EXPENDITURE PLAN**

The current local transportation sales tax has provided a substantial share of the total funding available for transportation projects in Alameda County, far exceeding annual state and federal commitments. State and federal sources have diminished over time, and local sources have come to represent over 60% of the money available for transportation in the county. The current measure has been indispensable in helping to meet the county’s growing needs in an era of shrinking resources.

The county’s ability to keep up with street maintenance needs, such as filling potholes and repaving roadways, is fundamentally dependent on these local funds. Targeted improvements funded through the current expenditure plan, such as the new express lane on I-680 and the widening of I-238, have relieved congestion on critical county commute corridors. A new Warm Springs BART station will soon open in the southern part of the county as the beginning of a new connection to Silicon Valley. The current plan has supported transit operations, improved the safety of children getting to schools throughout the county and funded special transportation services that provide over 900,000 trips for seniors and people with disabilities every year.

These local funds have also allowed the county to compete effectively for outside funds by providing local matching money. The existing expenditure plan has attracted supplemental funds of over $3 billion from outside sources for Alameda County transportation investments.

**WHY EXTEND AND AUGMENT THE SALES TAX MEASURE NOW?**

While the existing measure will remain intact through 2022, the 2012 Alameda County Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) has been developed for three reasons:

- The capital projects in the existing measure have been largely completed, with many projects implemented ahead of schedule. Virtually all of the project funds in the existing measure are committed to these current projects. Without a new plan, the County will be unable to fund any new major projects to address pressing mobility needs.
- Due to the economic recession, all sources of transportation funding have declined. The decline in revenues has had a particularly significant impact on transportation services that depend on annual sales tax revenue distributions for their ongoing operations. The greatest impacts have been to the programs that are most important to Alameda County residents:
  - Reductions in local funding to transit operators, combined with state and federal reductions, have resulted in higher fares and less service.
  - Reductions in local funding to programs for seniors and persons with disabilities have resulted in cuts in these programs as the populations depending on them continue to increase.
  - Local road maintenance programs have been cut, and road conditions have deteriorated for all types of users.
  - Bicycle and pedestrian system improvements and maintenance of pathways have continued to deteriorate, making it more difficult to walk and bike as an alternative to driving.
- Since the recession began, bus services in Alameda County have been cut significantly, and the gap between road maintenance needs and available funding is at an all-time high. This new expenditure plan will allow local funding to fill in the gaps created by declining state and federal revenue and will keep needed services in place and restore service cuts for many providers.

**HOW THIS PLAN WAS DEVELOPED**

This expenditure plan was developed in conjunction with the Alameda Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP), the long range policy document that guides transportation investments, programs, policies and advocacy for Alameda County through 2040. A Steering Committee and two working groups (technical and community) were established to guide development of both the CWTP and the TEP over the past two years.

Public engagement and transparency were the foundations of the development of these plans. A wide variety of stakeholders, including businesses, technical experts, environmental and social justice organizations, seniors and people with disabilities, helped shape the plan to ensure that it serves the county’s diverse transportation needs. Thousands of Alameda County residents participated through public workshops and facilitated small group dialogues; a website allowed for online questionnaires, access to all project information, and submittal of comments; and advisory committees that represent diverse constituencies were integrally involved in the plan development process from the beginning.

The TEP also benefited from a performance-based project evaluation process undertaken for the CWTP. This allowed policies and goals to be expressed in quantifiable terms and competing transportation investments to be compared to one another objectively. This led to a more systematic and analytical selection process for investment priorities.

City councils in the county and the County Board of Supervisors each held public meetings and voted to approve this expenditure plan and recommended submission of the sales tax measure to the voters.

**VISION AND GOALS**

The development of the Countywide Transportation Plan and the Transportation Expenditure Plan began with establishing a new vision and goals for the county’s transportation system:

Alameda County will be served by a premier transportation system that supports a vibrant and livable Alameda County through a connected and integrated multimodal transportation system promoting sustainability, access, transit operations, public health and economic
opportunities.
The vision recognizes the need to maintain and operate the County’s existing transportation infrastructure and services while developing new investments that are targeted, effective, financially sound and supported by appropriate land uses. Mobility in Alameda County will be guided by transparent decision-making and measureable performance indicators, and will be supported by these goals:

Our transportation system will be:

• Multimodal (bus, train, ferry, bicycle, walking and driving)
• Accessible, affordable and equitable for people of all ages, incomes, abilities and geographies
• Integrated with land use patterns and local decision-making
• Connected across the county, within and across the network of streets, highways, transit, bicycle and pedestrian routes
• Reliable and efficient
• Cost effective
• Well maintained
• Safe
• Supportive of a healthy and clean environment

TAXPAYER SAFEGUARDS

The commitments in this expenditure plan are underscored by a set of strong taxpayer safeguards to ensure that they are met. These include an annual independent audit and report to the taxpayers; ongoing monitoring and review by an Independent Watchdog Committee; requirement for full public review and periodic voter approval for a comprehensive update to the expenditure plan at least once prior to the end of 2042 and every 20 years thereafter; and strict limits on administrative expenses charged to these funds.

Local Funds Spent Locally

The revenue generated through this transportation sales tax will be spent exclusively on projects and programs in Alameda County. All of the projects and programs included in the expenditure plan are considered essential for the transportation needs of Alameda County.
## WHAT DOES THE EXPENDITURE PLAN FUND?

### Table 1  Summary of Investments by Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>FundsAllocated&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit &amp; Specialized Transit (48%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Transit: Operations, Access to Schools, Maintenance, and Safety Program</td>
<td>$1,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Transit For Seniors and Persons with Disabilities</td>
<td>$1,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Transit Efficiency and Priority</td>
<td>$1,35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART System Modernization and Expansion</td>
<td>$ 710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Rail Enhancements and High Speed Rail Connections</td>
<td>$ 355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Streets &amp; Roads (30%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Commute Corridors, Local Bridge Seismic Safety</td>
<td>$ 639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Corridors of Countywide Significance</td>
<td>$ 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets and Roads Program</td>
<td>$1,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway Efficiency &amp; Freight (9%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway/Efficiency and Gap Closure Projects</td>
<td>$ 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight &amp; Economic Development Program</td>
<td>$  77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure and Safety (8%)</strong></td>
<td>$ 651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainable Land Use &amp; Transportation Linkages (4%)</strong></td>
<td>$ 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Development Area (PDA) / Transit-Oriented Development (TOD)</td>
<td>$ 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Investments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology, Innovation, and Development (1%)</strong></td>
<td>$  77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NEW NET FUNDING (2013-42)</strong></td>
<td>$7,786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>Dollar figures for programs receiving a percentage of net funds throughout the TEP are based on the $7.7 billion estimate of total net tax receipts over the initial thirty years of the TEP in escalated dollars.
TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENTS

This Transportation Expenditure Plan describes a program anticipated to generate $7.7 billion in the first 30 years designed to sustainably, reliably and effectively move people and goods within the county and to connect Alameda County with the rest of the Bay Area. The projects and programs that follow describe the plan for investments between the approval of the tax in 2012 and its subsequent collections pursuant to comprehensive updates, at least once before the end of 2042 and every 20 years thereafter. These improvements are necessary to address current and projected transportation needs in Alameda County, current legislative mandates, and reflect the best efforts to achieve consensus among varied interests and communities in Alameda County.

The linkage between sustainable transportation and development has never been clearer. Recent legislation, including SB 375, requires transportation planning agencies to focus on connecting transportation with development policies to ensure that communities develop in a way that supports biking, walking and transit while maximizing accessibility for all modes. Transportation planning must also find ways to reduce the number of miles driven, reducing the production of greenhouse gases.

The projects and programs in this plan are designed to strengthen the economy and improve quality of life in Alameda County, and reduce traffic congestion. They include maintenance of existing infrastructure, targeted investments to improve highway safety, remove bottlenecks on major commute corridors, enhance rail, bus and ferry transit systems, and make it safer and easier to bike and walk throughout the county.

Two types of investments are funded in this plan: capital investments which are allocated specific dollar amounts in the plan, and programmatic investments which are allocated a percentage of net revenues to be distributed to program recipients on a monthly or periodic basis. Capital investments will be made based upon clearly defined project descriptions and limits resulting from the outcomes of environmental analyses, as applicable. Examples of programmatic investments include local road maintenance and transit operations which provide funds to local jurisdictions to complete on-going operations and maintenance tasks. The following summarizes total expenditures by mode including both capital and programmatic investments.

PUBLIC TRANSIT AND SPECIALIZED TRANSIT (48%)

Increasing the number of people that can be served by high capacity public transit is critical to all residents of Alameda County to provide transportation choices, relieve congestion and support a vibrant economy. The investments identified for public transit in this plan were guided by the principles of enhancing safety, convenience and reliability to maximize the number of people who can make use of the transit system. By more than doubling the amount of local sales tax funds available to transit operations and maintenance, this plan represents a major investment in Alameda County’s transit system to increase transit services and expand access to transit throughout the County, and to help avoid further service cuts and preserve affordability of transit.

LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS (30%)

Local streets and roads are the essential building blocks of Alameda County’s transportation system. Virtually every trip begins or ends on a local road. Alameda County has more than 3,400 road miles of aging streets and roads, many of which are in need of repair: intersections need to be reconfigured, traffic lights need to be synchronized and potholes need to be filled. Most important, these roads are essential to every mode of transportation from cars and trucks, to buses, bikes and pedestrians.

HIGHWAY EFFICIENCY, FREIGHT AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (9%)

Aging highway systems continue to operate under substantial pressure as travel patterns become more diverse and the demands of moving goods and people increases. While the era of major highway construction has come to an end in the Bay Area, there are many opportunities to increase the safety, efficiency and productivity of highway corridors in Alameda County. The highway investments included in this plan focus on improving safety, relieving bottlenecks at interchanges, closing gaps and improving efficiency with carpool and high occupancy vehicle infrastructure, and increasing safety on major truck route corridors.

In addition to focusing on making highways more efficient, this plan recognizes the need to move goods safely and effectively. Recognizing the economic importance of the Port of Oakland, highways must provide connections between goods and market, and do so with minimal impacts on our residential neighborhoods.

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN INFRASTRUCTURE (8%)

Virtually every trip begins or ends on foot. Alameda County’s bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure is the “glue” that holds the network together by extending the reach of transit service, providing a non-polluting and sustainable travel mode, and contributing to public health and quality of life. A particular focus is on the County’s youth to encourage adoption of safe and healthy habits through Safe Routes to Schools.

SUSTAINABLE LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION (4%) AND TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION (1%)

Transportation and land use linkages are strengthened when development focuses on bringing together mobility choices, housing and jobs. This plan includes investments in every part of the County, enhancing areas around BART stations and bus transfer hubs that are slated for new development, and supporting communities where biking, walking and transit riding are all desirable options. In addition, a Technology, Innovation and Development Program will support technological advances in transportation management and information.

The map on the follow page shows the investments planned for all modes and in all parts of the County.
Alameda County Projects by Category

- Bicycle and Pedestrian
- Highways & Freight
- Public Transit
- Transit Oriented Development (TOD)

Not Shown:
- Mass Transit Operations, Maintenance, and Safety Program
- Specialized Transit for Seniors and Persons with Disabilities
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Program
- Freight and Economic Development Program
- Local Streets and Roads Program
- Major Commute Corridor Improvements
- Technology, Innovation, and Development Program
PUBLIC TRANSIT AND SPECIALIZED TRANSIT INVESTMENTS

A total of 48% of net revenue from this tax will be dedicated to public transit systems. Funds for operations and maintenance will be provided to bus transit operators in the county (AC Transit, BART, Union City Transit and Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority) as well as to ferries and the ACE commuter rail system. In addition, these funds will substantially increase Alameda County’s commitment to the growing transportation needs of older adults and persons with disabilities, essentially doubling the funds available for targeted services for this important group. Grant funds are also available to support transportation access to schools. Major capital investments include upgrades to the existing BART system and a BART extension in the eastern part of the County, adding bus rapid transit routes to improve the utility and efficiency of transit, and providing funding for transit improvements across the Dumbarton Bridge.

TRANSIT OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE, AND SAFETY PROGRAM (24% OF NET REVENUE, $1,857 M)

This proposed program provides transit operators with a consistent funding source for maintaining, restoring and improving transit services in Alameda County. Transit operators will allocate these funds in consultation with their riders and policy makers with the goal of creating a world class transit system that is an efficient, effective, safe and affordable alternative to driving.

The proposed Transit Operations program has the following primary components.

Mass Transit Pass-Through Program (21.55% of net revenue, estimated at $1.668 M)

Pass-through funds are disbursed to AC Transit, BART, the Altamont Commuter Express (ACE) rail service, the Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA), the Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority (LAVTA) and Union City Transit. The relative percentage of net revenue being passed through to these agencies is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>% of Net Total Revenue</th>
<th>Total 2012-2042 (est.) $Millions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC Transit</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>$1,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>$77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Maintenance</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>$39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WETA (ferries)</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>$39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAVTA (WHEELS)</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>$39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union City Transit</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>$19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Transit</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.55%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,668</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access to School Program ($15 million)

This program is for the purposes of funding one or more models for a student transit pass program. The program would be designed to account for geographic differences within the county. Successful models determined through periodic reviews will have the first call for funding within the innovative grant program, as described below.

Innovative Grant Program including successful student transportation programs (2.24% of net revenue, estimated at $175 M)

These grant funds, administered by the Alameda CTC, will be used for the purposes of funding innovative and emerging transit projects, including implementing successful models aimed at increasing the use of transit among junior high and high school students, including a transit pass program for students in Alameda County. Successful models will receive the first priority for funding from this category. Funds will be periodically distributed, based upon Alameda CTC action, for projects and programs with proven ability to accomplish the goals listed below:

- Increase the use of public transit by youth riders (first priority for funding) and increase youth access to school
- Enhance the quality of service for transit riders
- Reduce costs or improve operating efficiency
- Increase transit ridership by improving the rider experience
- Enhance rider safety and security
- Enhance rider information and education about transit options
- Enhance affordability for transit riders
- Implement recommendations for transit service improvements from Community Based Transportation Plans

These funds will be distributed periodically by the Alameda CTC. Grant awards will emphasize demonstrations or pilot projects which can leverage other funds.

SPECIALIZED TRANSIT FOR SENIORS AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES (10% OF NET REVENUE, $774 M)

This program provides funds for local solutions to the growing transportation needs of older adults and persons with disabilities. Funds will be provided to transit operators to operate specialized transportation service mandated by the Americans with Disabilities Act. In addition, funds will be provided to each part of the County based on their population of residents over age 70 for local programs aimed at improving mobility for seniors and persons with disabilities. The program includes three components.

Pass-through funding for East Bay Paratransit Consortium (6% of net revenue, estimated at $464 M)

This funding will assist the East Bay Paratransit Consortium to meet the requirements of the American’s With Disabilities Act. These funds will be disbursed to and directed by the two agencies that operate the East Bay Paratransit Consortium:

- AC Transit will receive 4.5% of net proceeds annually, estimated at $348 M from 2012 to 2042 towards meeting its responsibilities under the Americans with Disabilities Act.
- BART will receive 1.5% of net proceeds annually,
projects on some of the busiest corridors in the AC Transit system.

AC Transit East Bay Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Projects ($25 M)

Bus Rapid Transit is a technology that reduces bus travel times, improves the efficiency of transit service and reduces conflicts between bus service and auto travel on major streets. Three BRT corridors are proposed:

• The Telegraph Avenue/East 14th/International Boulevard project will provide enhanced transit service connecting the Cities of San Leandro and Oakland with potential improved rapid bus services to UC Berkeley.

• The Grand/MacArthur BRT project will enhance transit service and allow for significant reliability improvements in this critical corridor as well as enhancing access to regional services at the MacArthur BART station.

• The Alameda to Fruitvale BART Rapid Bus service will provide a fast and reliable connection between the City of Alameda and the Fruitvale BART station, providing service to new development proposed for the City of Alameda.

Funds may be used for project development, design, construction, access and enhancement of the rapid transit corridors. These sales tax funds will allow the Telegraph/East 14th/International project to be completed and will provide needed local match to attract leveraged funds to the other corridors which are currently under development.

College/Broadway Corridor Transit Priority ($10 M)

Funding will be provided for the implementation of transit priority treatments to improve transit reliability, reduce travel times and encourage more transit riders on the well utilized College/Broadway corridor.
Not Shown:
- Specialized Transit for Seniors and Persons with Disabilities
- Innovative grants including potential youth transit pass program
- Mass Transit Operations, Maintenance and Safety Program for AC Transit, Altamont Commuter Express (ACE), Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA), Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority (LAVTA), and Union City Transit.
BART SYSTEM MODERNIZATION AND EXPANSION ($710 M)

The capital projects funded as part of the BART System Modernization and Expansion investments include projects that increase the capacity and utility of the existing system, as well as providing local funding for a proposed BART extension in the eastern part of the county.

BART to Livermore ($400 M)

This project funds the first phase of a BART Extension within the I-580 Corridor freeway alignment to the vicinity of the I-580/Isabel Avenue interchange using the most effective and efficient technology. Funds for construction for any element of this first phase project shall not be used until full funding commitments are identified and approved, and a project-specific environmental clearance is obtained. The project-specific environmental process will include a detailed alternative assessment of all fundable and feasible alternatives, and be consistent with mandates, policies and guidance of federal, state, and regional agencies that have jurisdiction over the environmental and project development process.

BART System Modernization and Capacity Enhancements ($310 M)

BART projections indicate that its system will need to carry over 700,000 daily riders by the end of this plan period. New riders will affect the capacity of existing systems and stations, requiring focused capacity enhancements to keep the system moving as ridership increases occur.

- **The Bay Fair Connector/BART METRO project will receive $100 M** in sales tax funds for the Alameda County portion of this project which will increase capacity and operational flexibility systemwide. One goal of these improvements will be to improve connections to jobs in the southern part of the county and beyond as Santa Clara County builds its own BART extension.

- **The BART Station Modernization and Capacity Program will receive $90 M** for improvements at all BART stations in Alameda County, addressing station site, building envelope, escalator and elevator rehabilitation/replacement, circulation & wayfinding, air conditioning, lighting & ambient environment, station reliability upgrades, and other station equipment replacement/upgrades.

- **The Irvington BART Station will receive $120 M** to provide an infill station on the soon-to-open Warm Springs extension south of the existing Fremont Station, creating new accessibility to BART in the southern part of the County.
BART INVESTMENTS

Not Shown:
- BART Station Modernization and Capacity Improvements
- Specialized Transit for Seniors and People with Disabilities

A Bay Fair Connector / BART METRO
B BART Extension to Livermore
C Irvington BART Station
REGIONAL RAIL ENHANCEMENTS AND HIGH SPEED RAIL CONNECTIONS ($355 M)

Investments include maintenance and service enhancements on existing rail lines and the development of new rail service over the Dumbarton Bridge. Funds will also be allocated for preserving rail right of way for transportation purposes, ensuring that service is available for future generations. Finally, this funding category acknowledges the importance of connecting high speed rail to Alameda County and the Bay Area and seeks to prioritize targeted investments to ensure strong connections to this future service.

Dumbarton Rail Corridor Implementation ($120 M)

The Dumbarton Rail Corridor Project will extend commuter services across the southern portion of the San Francisco Bay between the Peninsula and the East Bay. The project will link multiple transit services including Caltrain, the Altamont Express, Amtrak’s Capitol Corridor, BART, and East Bay bus systems at a multi-modal transit center in Union City. The environmental process will determine the most effective service in this corridor.

Union City Intermodal Station ($75 M)

This project funds the development of a new intermodal station in Union City to serve BART, Dumbarton Rail, Capitol Corridor, ACE and local and regional bus passengers. The project involves construction of a two-sided rail station and bus transit facility, accessible to a 30-acre transit oriented development site. Improvements will be made to pedestrian and bicycle access, BART parking, elevators, fare gates and other passenger amenities.

Capital Corridor Service Expansion ($40 M)

This project supports track improvements and train car procurement which will enable the trains running between Oakland and San Jose to increase daily round trips per day, matching frequencies between Sacramento and Oakland.

Railroad Corridor Right of Way Preservation and Track Improvements ($110 M)

Funds allocated by this project may be used to maintain and enhance existing railroad corridors for use as regional rail and other transportation purposes as well as to preserve the rights of way of rail corridors that could be used for other transportation purposes, such as major trails.

Oakland Broadway Corridor Transit ($10 M)

This project will link neighborhoods to transit stations along Broadway, Oakland’s major transit spine, providing a frequent and reliable connection between the regional rail hub at Jack London Square, with Downtown Oakland, the Uptown Arts and Entertainment District, and adjoining neighborhoods, utilizing the most efficient and effective technology.
REGIONAL RAIL INVESTMENTS

Not Shown:
- Railroad Corridor Right of Way Preservation and Track Improvements

A Broadway Corridor Transit
B Capitol Corridor Service Expansion
C Union City Intermodal Station
D Dumbarton Rail Corridor

For illustrative purposes only.
LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS
A total of 30% of the net revenue anticipated from this tax is dedicated to the improvement of local streets and roads. Streets and roads investments include two major components: a program that provides funding for local jurisdictions to maintain streets and roads, and a capital program that is focused on improving the performance of major commute routes and bridges throughout the County, including enhancing seismic safety.

The Streets and Roads program in this Expenditure Plan involves shared responsibility – local cities and the County will set their local priorities within a framework that requires complete streets to serve all users and types of transportation, honors best practices and encourages agencies to work together. More specifically, streets and roads expenditures will be designed to benefit all modes of travel by improving safety, accessibility, and convenience for all users of the street right-of-way. The plan also focuses on important commute corridors that carry the majority of the driving public and cross city boundaries, ensuring enhanced cooperation and coordination between agencies.

LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS MAINTENANCE AND SAFETY PROGRAM (20% OF NET REVENUES, $1,548 M)
In recognition that local streets and roads are the backbone of our transportation system, this program provides funds to local cities and Alameda County for maintaining and improving local infrastructure. Funds may be used for any local transportation need based on local priorities, including streets and road maintenance, bicycle and pedestrian projects, bus stops, and traffic calming. All projects implemented with these funds will support a “complete streets philosophy” where all modes and users are considered in the development of the local road system. A minimum of 15% of all local streets and roads funds will be spent on project elements directly benefitting bicyclists and pedestrians.

The Local Streets and Roads Maintenance and Safety program is designed as a pass-through program, with funds being provided to local jurisdictions to be used on locally determined priorities. Twenty percent of net revenues will be allocated to local cities and the county based on a formula that includes population and road miles for each jurisdiction, weighted equally, consistent with the current Measure B formula. The formula will be revisited within the first five years of the plan to ensure overall geographic equity in the TEP. This program is intended to augment, rather than replace, existing transportation funding.

MAJOR COMMUTE CORRIDORS, LOCAL BRIDGE AND SEISMIC SAFETY INVESTMENTS ($800 M)
Major commute routes, illustrated on the map on page CMB1-22, serve a high percentage of the daily commuters in Alameda County and the majority of trips for other purposes. These roads are crucial for the movement of goods to stores and consumers, for transit riders and for motorists, and for bicyclists and pedestrians. Concentrating improvements in these corridors will improve access and efficiencies, increase safety and reduce congestion.

This program focuses funding on improvements to major roads, bridges, freight improvements and railroad grade separations or quiet zones. Examples of commute corridors eligible for funding include, but are not limited to, the following:

- **North County Major Roadways:** Solano Avenue Pavement resurfacing and beautification; San Pablo Avenue Improvements; State Route 13/Ashby Avenue corridor; Marin Avenue local road safety; Gilman railroad crossing; Park Street, High Street and Fruitvale bridge replacements; Powell Street bridge widening at Christie; East 14th Street improvements, Oakland Army Base transportation infrastructure improvements.

- **Central County Major Roadways:** Crow Canyon Road safety improvements, San Leandro local road resurfacing, Lewelling Road/Hesperian Boulevard improvements, Tennyson Road grade separation.

- **South County Major Roadways:** East-west connector in North Fremont and Union City, I-680/I-880 cross connectors, Fremont Boulevard improvements, upgrades to the relinquished Route 84 in Fremont, Central Avenue Overcrossing, Thornton Ave widening, Mowry Ave., Newark local streets.

- **East County Major Roadways:** Greenville Road widening, El Charro Road improvements, Dougherty Road widening, Dublin Boulevard widening, Bernal Bridge construction.

- **Countywide Freight Corridors:** Outer Harbor Intermodal Terminal at the Port of Oakland, 7th Street grade separation and roadway improvement in Oakland, as well as truck routes serving the Port of Oakland.

Projects will be developed by local agencies working in cooperation with neighboring jurisdictions and the Alameda CTC to reduce congestion, remove bottlenecks, improve safety, enhance operations, and enhance alternatives to single occupant auto travel in these corridors. Projects will be funded based on project readiness, constructability, geographic equity, and cost effectiveness as determined by the Alameda CTC working with local jurisdictions as part of the Alameda CTC Capital Improvement Program which is updated every two years.
Examples of Major Roadways for Improvement:

North County: Solano Ave, San Pablo Ave, Ashby Ave, Marin Ave, Gilman Rail road Crossing, Park St, High St, Fruitvale Bridge, Powell St Bridge, East 14th St, and Oakland Army Base transportation improvements

Central County: Crow Canyon Rd, Hesperian Blvd, Lewelling Blvd, Tennyson Rd, and San Leandro local streets

South County: East-west connector, I-680/I-880 cross connectors, Fremont Blvd, Route 84 in Fremont, Central Ave Overcrossing, Thornton Ave, Mowry Ave, and Newark local streets

East County: Greenville Rd, El Charro Rd, Dougherty Rd, Dublin Blvd, and Bernal Bridge.

Countywide Freight Corridors: Truck routes serving the Port of Oakland, Outer Harbor Intermodal Terminal and 7th St Improvements.
HIGHWAY EFFICIENCY AND FREIGHT INVESTMENTS

The County’s aging highway system requires safety, access and gap closure improvements to enhance efficiencies on a largely built-out system. Funding has been allocated to each highway corridor in Alameda County for needed improvements. Specific projects have been identified based on project readiness, local priority and the availability to leverage current investments and funds. A number of additional eligible projects have been identified as candidates for corridor improvements, which will be selected for funding based on their contribution to the overall goals of improving system reliability, maximizing connectivity, improving the environment and reducing congestion. Priority implementation of specific investments and amounts will be determined as part of the Capital Improvement Program developed by the Alameda CTC every two years.

Most of the projects that have been identified for funding are designed to improve the efficiency of and access to existing investments and to close gaps and remove bottlenecks.

A total of 9% of the net revenue is allocated to the highway system, including 1%, or approximately $77 M, allocated specifically to goods movement and related projects.

I-80 CORRIDOR INVESTMENTS FROM THE CONTRA COSTA COUNTY LINE TO THE BAY BRIDGE ($76 M)

I-80 in the northern part of the County is the most congested stretch of freeway in the Bay Area. Investments in the interchanges on this route were selected to relieve bottlenecks, improve safety and improve conditions for cars, buses, trucks and bicyclists and pedestrians. Key investments will be made at the Ashby and Gilman interchanges in Berkeley, which will improve conditions for all modes in both Emeryville and Berkeley.

The I-80 Gilman project will receive funding to relieve a major bottleneck and safety problem at the I-80 Gilman interchange. The project includes both a major reconfiguration of the interchange and grade separation of the roadway and the railroad crossing which currently crosses Gilman at-grade impeding traffic flow to and from the freeway. Improvements will also be made for pedestrians and bicyclists crossing this location and accessing recreational opportunities west of the freeway, making this a true multimodal improvement.

The Ashby Avenue corridor will receive funding to fully reconstruct the Ashby Avenue Interchange by eliminating the substandard eastbound on-ramp in Berkeley’s Aquatic Park. The interchange will be fully accessible to vehicles traveling to and from Emeryville and Berkeley and east and west on I-80 will reduce local traffic congestion in Berkeley and Emeryville and will improve bicycle and pedestrian access. The project includes associated corridor improvements on Ashby Avenue.
I-80 Corridor Improvement Program

I-880 Corridor Improvement Program

I-680 Corridor Improvement Program

SR-84 Corridor Improvement Program

Not Shown:
- Freight and Economic Development Program

Data Sources: Alameda County, ESRI

For illustrative purposes only

I-80 Corridor Improvements include:
- Gilman St Interchange Improvements
- Ashby Ave Interchange Improvements

I-880 Corridor Improvements include:
- Broadway-Jackson Multimodal Transportation and Circulation Improvements
- Oak Street Interchange Improvements
- 23rd/29th Ave Interchange Improvements
- 42nd St/High St Interchange Improvements
- Northbound High Occupancy Vehicle and High Occupancy Toll Extension from A St to Hegenberger
- Winton Ave Interchange Improvements
- Industrial Pkwy Interchange Improvements
- Whipple Rd Interchange Improvements
- Rte 262 (Mission) Improvements and Grade Separation

I-580 Corridor Improvements include:
- I-580/I-680 Interchange Improvements
- Isabel Ave Interchange Improvements
- Greenville Rd Interchange Improvements
- Vasco Rd Interchange Improvements

I-680 Corridor Improvements include:
- High Occupancy Vehicle and High Occupancy Toll Lane from SR-237 to Alcosta (both directions)

SR-84 Corridor Improvements include:
- SR-84 Expressway (Pigeon Pass to Jack London)
- SR-84/I-680 Interchange and SR-84 Widening
STATE ROUTE 84 FROM I-580 TO I-680 ($132 M)
Two significant improvements are planned for this corridor to complete improvements at the SR 84 and I-680 interchange and widening SR 84 to support safety, connectivity and efficiency.

I-680 FROM CONTRA COSTA COUNTY LINE TO THE SANTA CLARA COUNTY LINE ($60 M)
Implementation of the I-680 HOV/HOT lane in both directions from Route 237 to Alcosta Boulevard is the centerpiece of the improvements planned for this heavily traveled corridor. This project will receive $60 M to construct carpool/high occupancy toll lanes on I-680 between Alcosta Boulevard and Route 84 in both directions.

I-580 CORRIDOR INVESTMENTS FROM DUBLIN TO SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY LINE ($48 M)
Investments in the I-580 corridor include improvements to the I-580/I-680 Interchange to provide relief on one of the most significant bottlenecks on the freeway system. Additional funding is for interchange improvements in both East and Central County, including improvements at Vasco Road, Greenville Road and Isabel Avenue, which are needed for major transit investments in the Livermore area, as well as interchange improvements in Central County, focusing on bottleneck relief and safety improvements.

I-880 CORRIDOR INVESTMENTS FROM OAKLAND TO UNION CITY ($284 M)
I-880 corridor improvements include projects to upgrade and improve key interchanges throughout the corridor beginning with the Broadway/Jackson interchange and Oak Street interchange in Oakland and Alameda to the Whipple/Industrial Parkway Southwest interchange in Hayward and to the County line. Many other interchange projects are also candidates for funding to relieve congestion and improve safety.

Funds are included for I-880 Broadway-Jackson multimodal transportation and circulation improvements for Alameda Point, Oakland Chinatown, Downtown Oakland, and Jack London Square.

Funds for interchange improvements at Whipple Road and Industrial Boulevard in the Central part of the County are also included, as well as making other improvements on I-880. The goals of these improvements are to remove bottlenecks and enhance safety at these critical interchanges, serving motorists, other road users, and goods movement in Central and Southern Alameda County.

In addition, funding will support completion of the HOV/HOT carpool lanes on I-880 from A Street in Hayward to Hegenberger Road in Oakland, filling in this important gap...
in the HOV lane system.

Additional funding on I-880 includes a number of critical access and interchange improvements in the north and central parts of the county including grade separations, bridge improvements and interchange enhancements.

**FREIGHT AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (1% OF NET REVENUE, $77 M)**

These discretionary funds will be administered by the Alameda CTC for the purposes of developing innovative approaches to moving goods in a safe and healthy environment in support of a robust economy. Eligible expenditures in this category include:

- Planning, development and implementation of projects that enhance the safe transport of freight by truck or rail in Alameda County, including projects that reduce conflicts between freight movement and other modes.
- Planning, development and implementation of projects that reduce greenhouse gas production in the transport of goods.
- Planning, development and implementation of projects that mitigate environmental impacts of freight movement on residential neighborhoods.
- Planning, development and implementation of projects that enhance coordination between the Port of Oakland, Oakland Airport and local jurisdictions for the purposes of improving the efficiency, safety, and environmental and noise impacts of freight operations while promoting a vibrant economy.

These proposed funds will be distributed by the Alameda CTC to eligible public agencies within Alameda County. Eligible public agencies will include local jurisdictions including cities, Alameda County, the Port of Oakland and the Oakland Airport.

**BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN INVESTMENTS**

Key investments in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure include completion of the major trails in the County. Funding will allow for the completion of three key trails: the County’s East Bay Greenway, which provides a viable commute and community access route for many cyclists and pedestrians from Oakland to Fremont, and the Bay Trail and Iron Horse trails in Alameda County which provide important off street routes for both commute and recreational trips. Funding for priority projects in local and countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian plans and programs, focusing on completing the high priority projects described in their Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plans. Funds will be provided to each city within the county and to Alameda County based on their share of population. Jurisdictions will be expected to implement, operate and maintain projects from the County’s bicycle and pedestrian plans and to commit to a complete streets philosophy in their project design and implementation.

**TRAIL, BAY TRAIL AND EAST BAY GREENWAY COMPLETION OF MAJOR TRAILS – IRON HORSE TRAIL, BAY TRAIL AND EAST BAY GREENWAY ($264 M)**

This project provides for increased pedestrian and bicycle transportation options, more open space, and improved public safety in neighborhoods on these three major trails pictured on the next page. These projects have the potential to generate extensive and varied community benefits beyond creating infrastructure for bicycle and pedestrian travel including improving neighborhood connectivity, improving access to transit, reducing local congestion, improving safe access to schools, supporting community health and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Funds may be applied to the construction and maintenance of the three major trails, as well as local connectors and access routes.

**LOCAL BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY PROGRAM (5% OF NET REVENUE, $387 M)**

This proposed program is designed to fund projects and provide operating funds that expand and enhance bicycle and pedestrian safety and facilities in Alameda County, focusing on projects that complete the County’s bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure system. The proposed program consists of two components.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Direct Allocation to Cities and Alameda County (3% of net revenue, estimated at $232 M)**

Pass-through funding will be provided on a monthly basis to the cities and to Alameda County for planning, construction and maintenance of bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs, focusing on completing the high priority projects described in their Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plans. Funds will be provided to each city within the county and to Alameda County based on their share of population. Jurisdictions will be expected to implement, operate and maintain projects from the County’s bicycle and pedestrian plans and to commit to a complete streets philosophy in their project design and implementation.

**Bike and Pedestrian Grant Program (2% of net revenue, estimated at $154 M)**

These funds, administered by the Alameda CTC, will be available for the purposes of implementing and maintaining regional bicycle and pedestrian facilities and increasing safe bicycling. These proposed funds will be periodically distributed by the Alameda CTC for projects and programs that:

- Provide bicycle education and training
- Increase the number of trips made by bicycle and on foot
- Improve coordination between jurisdictions
- Maintain existing trails
- Implement major elements of the Alameda County Bicycle Master Plan and Pedestrian Master Plan
- Implement bicycle and pedestrian elements of Community Based Transportation Plans
- Support Safe Routes to Schools

CMB1-26
• Support school crossing guards
• Provide bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure within and connecting to developments in priority development areas
• Leverage other sources of funding
Funds in this category will be used for a Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator position.
East Bay Greenway from Oakland to Fremont
Bay Trail Gap Closure and Access projects
Iron Horse Trail Gap Closure and Access projects

Not Shown:
- Completion of other priority projects in local and countywide bicycle and pedestrian plans
- Pass-through program to cities and County
- Grant program for regional projects and trail maintenance.
SUSTAINABLE LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION
Investments in sustainable transportation and land use linkages recognize the need to plan our transportation system along with the land uses that are going to serve the growing demand for housing and jobs in Alameda County. A total of 4% of net revenue or about $300 M is dedicated to improvements that link our transportation infrastructure with areas identified for new development. One percent of net revenue, or about $77 M, is dedicated to investments in new technology, innovation and development.

PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT AREA/TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS ($300 M)
These investments target immediate term opportunities for enhancing access, improving safety and creating new infrastructure and supporting construction at BART stations, as well as station area development and transit oriented development at sites identified for early implementation throughout the County. Funds in this category may be spent on project development, design, and environmental clearance as well as construction, operations and maintenance of new infrastructure in these areas. Priority implementation of specific investments and amounts will be determined as part of the Capital Improvement Program developed by the Alameda CTC every two years. Examples of eligible station areas to be included in this category are:

**North County Station Areas and Priority Development Areas**
- Broadway Valdez Priority Development Area (PDA)
- Coliseum BART Station Enhancements
- Lake Merritt BART Station and Area Improvements
- West Oakland BART Station Area
- Eastmont Mall Priority Development Area (PDA)
- 19th Street BART Station Area
- MacArthur BART Station Area
- Ashby BART Station Area
- Berkeley Downtown Station Area

**Central County Station Areas and Priority Development Areas**
- Downtown San Leandro Transit Oriented Development (TOD)
- Bay Fair BART Transit Village
- San Leandro City Streetscape Project
- South Hayward BART Station Area

**South County Station Areas and Priority Development Areas**
- BART Warm Springs Westside Access Improvements
- Fremont Boulevard Streetscape Project
- Union City Intermodal Infrastructure Improvements
- Dumbarton Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Infrastructure improvements

East County Station Areas
- West Dublin BART Station and Area Improvements
- Downtown Dublin Transit Oriented Development (TOD)
- East Dublin / Pleasanton BART Station and Area Improvements
NORTH

A Berkeley Downtown Station Area
B Ashby BART Station Area
C MacArthur BART Station Area
D Broadway Valdez PDA
E 19th St BART Station Area
F West Oakland BART Station Area
G Lake Merritt BART Station and Area Improvements
H Eastmont Mall PDA
I Coliseum BART Station Enhancements

EAST

R West Dublin BART Station and Area Improvements
Downtown Dublin TOD
S East Dublin/Pleasanton BART Station and Area Improvements

SOUTH

N Union City Intermodal Infrastructure Improvements
O Fremont Boulevard Streetscape
P BART Warm Springs West Side Access Improvements
Q Dumbarton TOD Infrastructure Improvements

Not Shown:
- Technology, Innovation, and Development Program

The locations drawn on this map are general locations of eligible types of investments.

For illustrative purposes only.
INVESTMENTS IN NEW TECHNOLOGY, INNOVATION AND DEVELOPMENT (1% OF NET REVENUE, $77 M)

These proposed discretionary funds are designed to be administered by the Alameda CTC to develop innovative approaches to meeting the County’s transportation vision, emphasizing the use of new and emerging technologies to better manage the transportation system. Eligible expenditures in this category include:

- Planning, development, implementation and maintenance of new technology and innovative strategies designed to improve the efficiency or effectiveness of the County’s transportation system.
- Planning, development, implementation and maintenance of new technology and innovative strategies designed to better inform consumers of their transportation choices.
- Planning, development, implementation and maintenance of new technology and innovative strategies designed to increase utilization of non-auto modes or to increase the occupancy of autos with the goal of reducing congestion and greenhouse gas production.
- Environmental mitigation for transportation projects including land banking.
- Planning, development and implementation of demand management strategies designed to reduce congestion, increase use of non-auto modes, manage existing infrastructure and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- Planning, development and implementation of transportation policies designed to manage parking supply to improve availability, utilization and to reduce congestion and greenhouse gas production.

These proposed funds would be distributed periodically by the Alameda CTC to eligible public agencies within Alameda County.

GOVERNING BODY AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Implementation of this sales tax is authorized under the Local Transportation Authority and Improvement Act, California Public Utilities Code Section 180000 et seq. In enacting this ordinance, voters will authorize the Alameda County Transportation Commission (referred to herein as the Alameda CTC) to have the responsibility to administer the tax proceeds in accordance with all applicable laws and with the Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP). Funds collected for this tax may be spent only for the purposes identified in the TEP, as it may be amended as described in the implementation guidelines. Under no circumstances may the proceeds of this transportation sales tax be applied to any purpose other than for transportation improvements benefitting Alameda County. Under no circumstances may these funds be appropriated by the State of California or any other governmental agency.

The Alameda County Transportation Commission was created in July 2010 through a merger of two existing agencies: the Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority, which administered the existing Measure B half-cent transportation sales tax, and the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency, which was responsible for long-range planning and programming of transportation funds. The merger was designed to save taxpayer money by developing a single, streamlined organization focused on planning, funding and delivering countywide projects and programs with local, regional, state and federal funds in the most efficient and effective manner to serve the county’s transportation needs. The merger has resulted in millions of dollars of savings to taxpayer’s on an annual basis.

GOVERNING BODY AND ADMINISTRATION

The Alameda CTC is governed by a Commission comprised of 22 members, with the following representation:

- All five Alameda County supervisors
- Two Oakland representatives
- One representative from each of the other 13 cities
- AC Transit
- BART

The Commission is assisted by staff dedicated to implementation and monitoring of sales tax projects and programs. The total cost assigned for salaries and benefits for administrative employees shall not exceed 1% of the revenues generated by the sales tax. The total cost of administration of this tax, including all rent, supplies, consulting services and other overhead costs will not exceed 4% of the proceeds of the tax. In addition, funds to repay election costs are included herein.

INDEPENDENT WATCHDOG COMMITTEE

The Independent Watchdog Committee will have the responsibility of reviewing and overseeing all expenditures of sales tax funds by the Alameda CTC. The Independent Watchdog Committee (IWC) reports directly to the public.

The responsibilities of this committee are:

- The IWC must hold public hearings and issue reports, on at least an annual basis, to inform Alameda County residents about how the sales tax funds are being spent. The hearings will be open to the public and must be held in compliance with the Brown Act, California’s open meeting law, with information announcing the hearings well-publicized and posted in advance.
- The IWC will have full access to the Alameda CTC’s independent auditor and will have the authority to request and review specific information regarding use of the sales tax funds and to comment on the auditor’s reports.
- The IWC will publish an independent annual report, including any concerns the committee has about
PAPCO addresses funding, planning, and coordination issues regarding specialized transportation services for seniors and persons with disabilities in Alameda County. PAPCO has the responsibility of making direct recommendations to the Board of Directors of the Alameda CTC on funding for senior and disabled transportation services. PAPCO is supported by a Technical Advisory Committee comprised of paratransit providers in Alameda County funded by local transportation sales tax funds.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
The BPAC reviews all competitive applications submitted to the Alameda CTC for bicycle and pedestrian safety funds from Measure B, along with the development and updating of the Alameda Countywide Pedestrian and Bicycle Plans and makes recommendations to the Alameda CTC for funding. The BPAC also provides input on countywide educational and promotional programs and other projects of countywide significance, upon request.

Other Committees
The Alameda CTC will establish other community and technical advisory committees as necessary to implement the projects and programs in the TEP and to inform and educate the public on the use of funds for projects and programs in the TEP.

IMPLEMENTING GUIDELINES
This Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) is guided by principles that ensure that the revenue generated by the sales tax is spent only for the purposes outlined in this plan, in the most efficient and effective manner possible, consistent with the direction provided by the voters of Alameda County.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE PLAN
1. Funds only Projects and Programs in TEP: Funds collected under this measure may be spent only for the purposes identified in the Transportation Expenditure Plan, or as it may be amended by the Alameda CTC governing body.

2. All Decisions Made in Public Process: The Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) is given the fiduciary duty of administering the transportation sales tax proceeds in accordance with all applicable laws and with the TEP. Activities of the Alameda CTC Board of Directors will be conducted in public according to state law, through publicly noticed meetings. The annual budgets of the Alameda CTC, annual strategic plans and annual reports will all be prepared for public review. The interests of the public will be further protected by an Independent Watchdog Committee, described previously in this plan.

3. Salary and Administration Cost Caps: The Alameda CTC will have the authority to hire professional staff and consultants to deliver the projects and programs included in this plan in the most efficient and cost-effective manner. The salaries and benefits for administrative staff hired by the Alameda CTC for this tax will not exceed 1% of the proceeds of the tax.
The total of all administrative costs including overhead costs such as rent and supplies will be limited to no more than 4% of the proceeds of this tax.

The cost of Alameda CTC staff who directly implement specific projects or programs are not included in administrative costs.

4. Amendments Require 2/3 Support: To modify and amend this plan, an amendment must be adopted by a two-thirds vote of the Alameda CTC Commissioners. All jurisdictions within the county will be given a minimum of 45 days to comment on any proposed TEP amendment.

5. Augment Transportation Funds: Pursuant to California Public Utilities Code 180001 (c), it is the intent of this expenditure plan that funds generated by the transportation sales tax be used to supplement and not replace existing local revenues used for transportation purposes.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE PROCESS

6. Comprehensive Plan Updates: While the transportation sales tax is intended to be collected in perpetuity, this plan recognizes that transportation needs, technology, and circumstances change over time. This plan is intended to govern the expenditure of new transportation sales tax funds (not including the existing Measure B funds), collected from implementation in 2013 through subsequent tax collections for an unlimited period, unless otherwise terminated by the voters.

7. Comprehensive Plan Update Schedule: The TEP will undergo a comprehensive update at least one time no later than the last general election prior to the end of 2042 and then at least once every 20 years thereafter.

8. Approval of a Comprehensive Updated Plan: In order to adopt a comprehensive updated expenditure plan, the Alameda County Transportation Commission will appoint an Expenditure Plan Update Advisory Committee, representing the diverse interests of Alameda County residents, businesses and community organizations to assist in updating the plan. The meetings of this committee will be publicly noticed, and the committee will be responsible for developing a public process for soliciting input into the comprehensive plan update.

A recommendation for the adoption of the updated expenditure plan shall require a two-thirds vote of the Alameda CTC Commissioners and shall be taken back to the local jurisdictions including the cities, Alameda County and transit agencies for review and comment. The comprehensive plan update will appear on a general election ballot in Alameda County for approval by the voters, requiring a majority vote.

All meetings at which a comprehensive plan update is considered will be conducted in accordance with all public meeting laws and public notice requirements and will be done to allow for maximum public input into the development of updating the plan.

TAXPAYER SAFEGUARDS, AUDITS AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Accountability is of utmost importance in delivering public investments with public dollars. The Alameda CTC is committed to transparency and accountability as a public agency along with its many jurisdictional partners and there are many measures built into this measure to ensure voter accountability in expenditure of funds.

9. Annual Audits and Independent Watchdog Committee Review: Transportation sales tax expenditures are subject to an annual independent audit and review by an Independent Watchdog Committee. The Watchdog Committee will prepare an annual report on spending and progress in implementing the plan that will be published and distributed throughout Alameda County.

10. Strict Project Deadlines: To ensure that the projects promised in this plan can be completed in a timely manner, each project will be given a period of seven years from the first year of revenue collection (up to December 31, 2019) to receive environmental clearance approvals and to have a full funding plan for each project. Project sponsors may appeal to the Alameda CTC Commissioners for one-year time extensions.

11. Timely Use of Funds: Jurisdictions receiving funds for transit operations, on-going road maintenance, services for seniors and disabled, and bicycle and pedestrian safety projects and programs must expend the funds expeditiously and report annually on the expenditure, their benefits and future planned expenditures. These reports will be made available to the public at the beginning of each calendar year.

12. Annual Budget and Strategic Plan: Each year, the Alameda CTC adopts an annual budget that projects the expected sales tax receipts, other anticipated funds and planned expenditures for administration, programs and projects. The Alameda CTC will also prepare an annual Strategic Plan which will identify the priority for projects and dates for project implementation based on project readiness, ability to generate leveraged funds and other relevant criteria. Both the budget and the Strategic Plan will be adopted at a public meeting of the Alameda CTC Commissioners.

13. Commitments from Fund Recipients: All recipients of funds allocated in this expenditure plan will be required to sign a Master Funding Agreement, detailing their roles and responsibilities in spending sales tax funds and including local hiring requirements. Funding agreements will include performance and accountability measures. In addition, fund recipients will conduct an annual audit to ensure that funds are managed and spent according to the requirements of this expenditure plan.

14. Capital Improvement Program Updates: Project descriptions will be detailed and fully defined for inclusion in the Alameda CTC Capital Improvement Program which will be updated every two years, and
which will provide for geographic equity in overall funding allocations. All allocations will be made through a public process.

15. Geographic Equity: Funding formulas for all programs will be revisited within the first five years of the plan to ensure overall geographic equity based on population and/or other equity factors. Funding for capital projects will be evaluated through the biennial capital improvement planning process which will include an evaluation of geographic equity by planning area.

RESTRICTIONS ON FUNDS

16. No Expenditures Outside of Alameda County: Under no circumstances may the proceeds of this transportation sales tax be applied to any purpose other than for transportation improvements benefitting Alameda County. Under no circumstances may these funds be appropriated by the State of California or any other governmental agency, as defined in the implementation guidelines.

17. Environmental and Equity Reviews: All projects funded by sales tax proceeds are subject to laws and regulations of federal, state and local government, including but not limited to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, as applicable. All projects and programs funded with sales tax funds will be required to conform to the requirements of these regulations, as applicable. All projects that go through environmental review analyses will select the most efficient and effective project alternative and technology for implementation to meet the objective of the project, and will have clearly defined project descriptions, limits and locations as a result of the environmental process.

18. Complete Streets: It is the policy of the Alameda CTC that all transportation investments shall consider the needs of all modes and all users. All investments will conform to Complete Streets requirements and Alameda County guidelines to ensure that all modes and all users are considered in the expenditure of funds so that there are appropriate investments that fit the function and context of facilities that will be constructed.

19. Local Contracting and Jobs: The Alameda CTC will develop a policy supporting the hiring of local contractors, businesses and residents from Alameda County as applicable in the expenditure of these funds.

20. New Agencies: New cities or new entities (such as new transit agencies) that come into existence in Alameda County during the life of the Plan could be considered as eligible recipients of funds through a Plan amendment.

PROJECT FINANCING GUIDELINES AND MANAGING REVENUE FLUCTUATIONS

21. Fiduciary Duty: By augmenting and extending the transportation sales tax, the Alameda CTC is given the fiduciary duty of administering the proceeds of this tax for the benefit of the residents and businesses of Alameda County. Funds may be accumulated by the Alameda CTC or by recipient agencies over a period of time to pay for larger and longer-term projects pursuant to the policies adopted by the Alameda CTC. All interest income generated by these proceeds will be used for the purposes outlined in this TEP and will be subject to audits.

22. Project and Program Financing: The Alameda CTC will have the authority to bond for the purposes of expediting the delivery of transportation projects and programs. The bonds will be paid with the proceeds of this tax. The costs associated with bonding, including interest payments, will be borne only by the capital projects included in the TEP and any programs included in the TEP that utilize the bond proceeds. The costs and risks associated with bonding will be presented in the Alameda CTC’s annual Strategic Plan and will be subject to public comment before any bond sale is approved.

23. Programming of Funds: Actual revenues may, at times, be higher than expected in this plan due to changes in receipts and additional funds may become available due to increased opportunities for leveraging or project costs less than expected. Revenue may be lower than expected as the economy fluctuates. Estimates of actual revenue will be calculated annually by the Alameda CTC during its annual budget process. Any excess revenue will be programmed in a manner that will accelerate the implementation of the projects and programs described in this plan, at the direction of the Alameda CTC Commissioners.

24. Fund Allocations: Should a planned project become infeasible or unfundable due to circumstances unforeseen at the time of this plan, or should a project not require all funds programmed for that project, funding will remain within its modal category such as Transit, Roads, Highways, Sustainable Transportation and Land Use, or Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety, and be reallocated to projects or programs in the same funding category at the discretion of the Alameda CTC.

25. Leveraging Funds: Leveraging or matching of outside funding sources is strongly encouraged. Any additional transportation sales tax revenues made available through their replacement by matching funds will be spent based on the principles outlined for fund allocations described above.
### Appendix A: Full List of TEP Investments by Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Investment Category</th>
<th>Project/Program</th>
<th>$ Amount</th>
<th>% of Total Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mass Transit:</td>
<td>AC Transit</td>
<td>$1,455.15</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operations,</td>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>$ 77.40</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance,</td>
<td>BART Maintenance</td>
<td>$ 38.70</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety Program</td>
<td>WETA</td>
<td>$ 38.70</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialized Transit</td>
<td>LAVTA</td>
<td>$ 38.70</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For Seniors and</td>
<td>Union City Transit</td>
<td>$ 19.35</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persons with</td>
<td>Innovative grant funds, including</td>
<td>$ 174.63</td>
<td>2.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disabilities</td>
<td>Access to School Program</td>
<td>$ 15.00</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>$1,857.64</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialized Transit</td>
<td>City-based and Locally Mandated</td>
<td>$ 232.20</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For Seniors</td>
<td>East Bay Paratransit - AC Transit</td>
<td>$ 348.31</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Persons with</td>
<td>East Bay Paratransit - BART</td>
<td>$ 116.10</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disabilities</td>
<td>Coordination and Gap Grants</td>
<td>$ 77.40</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>$ 774.02</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus Transit</td>
<td>Telegraph Avenue/East 14th/International Boulevard project</td>
<td>$ 10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efficiency and</td>
<td>Alameda to Fruitvale BART Rapid Bus</td>
<td>$ 9.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Grand/Macarthur BRT</td>
<td>$ 6.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>College/Broadway Corridor Transit Priority</td>
<td>$ 10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>$ 35.00</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BART System</td>
<td>Irvington BART Station</td>
<td>$ 120.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modernization and</td>
<td>Bay Fair Connector/BART METRO</td>
<td>$ 100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity Enhancements</td>
<td>BART Station Modernization and Capacity Program</td>
<td>$ 90.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BART to Livermore</td>
<td>$ 400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>$ 710.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Rail</td>
<td>Dumbarton Rail Corridor</td>
<td>$ 120.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhancements and</td>
<td>Union City Intermodal Station</td>
<td>$ 75.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Speed Rail</td>
<td>Railroad Corridor Right of Way Preservation and Track Improvements</td>
<td>$ 110.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connections</td>
<td>Oakland Broadway Corridor Transit</td>
<td>$ 10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capitol Corridor Service Expansion</td>
<td>$ 40.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>$ 355.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,731.66</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Priority implementation of specific investments and amounts for fully defined capital projects and phases will be determined as part of the Capital Improvement Program developed through a public process and adopted by the Alameda CTC every two years and will include geographic equity provisions.

BART Maintenance funds will require an equal amount of matching funds and must be spent in Alameda County.

All recipients of sales tax funds will be required to enter into agreements which will include performance and accountability measures.
### Appendix A: Full List of TEP Investments by Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Investment Category</th>
<th>Project/Program</th>
<th>$ Amount</th>
<th>% of Total Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>North County Example Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solano Avenue Pavement resurfacing &amp; beautification; San Pablo Avenue Improvements; SR 13/Ashby Avenue Corridor; Marin Avenue local road safety; Gilman railroad crossing; Park Street, High Street, and Fruitvale Bridge Replacement; Powell Street Bridge widening at Christie; East 14th Street; Oakland Army Base transportation infrastructure improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets &amp; Roads (30%)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Central County Example Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crow Canyon Road safety; San Leandro LS&amp;R*; Lewelling Blvd/Hesperian Blvd.; Tennyson Road Grade Separation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>South County Example Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East-West Connector in North Fremont and Union City; I-680/I-880 cross connectors; widen Fremont Boulevard from I-880 to Grimmer Boulevard; upgrades to relinquished Route 84 in Fremont; Central Avenue overcrossing; Thornton Ave widening; Newark LS&amp;R</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>East County Example Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>El Charro road improvements; Dougherty Road widening; Dublin Boulevard widening; Greenville Road widening; Bernal Bridge Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Countywide Freight Corridors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outer Harbor Intermodal Terminal; 7th Street Grade Separation and Roadway Improvement; Truck Routes serving the Port of Oakland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Direct Allocation to Cities and County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local streets and roads program</td>
<td>$1,548.03</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$2,348.03</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Priority implementation of specific investments and amounts for fully defined capital projects and phases will be determined as part of the Capital Improvement Program developed through a public process and adopted by the Alameda CTC every two years and will include geographic equity provisions.

All recipients of sales tax funds will be required to enter into agreements which will include performance and accountability measures.

*This includes $30 million for San Leandro local streets and roads improvements
Appendix A: Full List of TEP Investments by Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Investment Category</th>
<th>Project/Program</th>
<th>$ Amount</th>
<th>% of Total Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-80 Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>I-80 Gilman Street Interchange improvements</td>
<td>$ 24.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I-80 Ashby Interchange improvements</td>
<td>$ 52.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 76.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SR-84 Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>SR-84/I-680 Interchange and SR-84 Widening</td>
<td>$122.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SR-84 Expressway Widening (Pigeon Pass to Jack London)</td>
<td>$ 10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$132.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-580 Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>I-580/I-680 Interchange improvements</td>
<td>$ 20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I-580 Local Interchange Improvement Program: Interchange improvements - Greenville, Vasco, Isabel Avenue (Phase 2); Central County I-580 spot intersection improvements</td>
<td>$ 28.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 48.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-680 Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>I-680 HOT/HOV Lane from SR-237 to Alcosta</td>
<td>$ 60.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 60.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>8%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway Efficiency &amp; Freight (9%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>I-880 Improvements</strong></td>
<td>I-880 NB HOV/HOT Extension from A St. to Hegenberger</td>
<td>$ 20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I-880 Broadway/Jackson multimodal transportation and circulation improvements</td>
<td>$ 75.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whipple Road / Industrial Parkway Southwest Interchange improvements</td>
<td>$ 60.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I-880 Industrial Parkway Interchange improvements</td>
<td>$ 44.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I-880 Local Access and Safety improvements: Interchange improvements - Winton Avenue; 23rd/29th Ave., Oakland; 42nd Street/ High Street; Route 262 (Mission) improvements and grade separation; Oak Street</td>
<td>$ 85.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$284.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway Capital Projects</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$600.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freight &amp; Economic Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Freight and economic development program</td>
<td>$ 77.40</td>
<td><strong>1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$677.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>9%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Priority implementation of specific investments and amounts for fully defined capital projects and phases will be determined as part of the Capital Improvement Program developed through a public process and adopted by the Alameda CTC every two years and will include geographic equity provisions.

All recipients of sales tax funds will be required to enter into agreements which will include performance and accountability measures.
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### Appendix A: Full List of TEP Investments by Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Investment Category</th>
<th>Project/Program</th>
<th>$ Amount</th>
<th>% of Total Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle and Pedestrian (8%)</td>
<td>Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructre &amp; Safety</td>
<td>Gap Closure on Three Major Trails: Iron Horse, Bay Trail, and East Bay Greenway/UPRR Corridor</td>
<td>$264.00</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycle and pedestrian direct allocation to cities and Alameda County</td>
<td>$232.20</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bike and Pedestrian grant program for regional projects and trail maintenance</td>
<td>$154.80</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$651.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>8%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Land Use &amp; Transportation Linkages (4%)</td>
<td>Priority Development Area (PDA) / Transit-oriented Development (TOD) Infrastructure Investments</td>
<td><strong>North County Example Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Broadway Valdez Priority Development Area; Eastmont Mall Priority Development Area; BART station areas: Oakland Coliseum; Lake Merritt; West Oakland; 19th St; MacArthur; Ashby; Berkeley Downtown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Central County Example Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Downtown San Leandro TOD; Bay Fair BART Transit Village; San Leandro City Streetscape Project; South Hayward BART Station Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>South County Example Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BART Warm Springs West Side Access Improvements; Fremont Boulevard Streetscape Project; Union City Intermodal Infrastructure Improvements; Dumbarton TOD Infrastructure Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>East County Example Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Dublin BART Station and Area Improvements; Downtown Dublin TOD; East Dublin/ Pleasanton BART Station and Area Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$300.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>4%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$300.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>4%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology (1%)</td>
<td>Technology, Innovation, and Development</td>
<td>Technology, Innovation, and Development program</td>
<td>$77.40</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL NEW NET FUNDING (2013-42)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,786.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Priority implementation of specific investments and amounts for fully defined capital projects and phases will be determined as part of the Capital Improvement Program developed through a public process and adopted by the Alameda CTC every two years and will include geographic equity provisions.

All recipients of sales tax funds will be required to enter into agreements which will include performance and accountability measures.

* Preliminary allocation of North County Funds subject to change by Alameda CTC: Coliseum BART Area ($40 M), Broadway Valdez ($20 M), Lake Merritt ($20 M), West Oakland ($20 M), Eastmont Mall ($20 M), 19th Street ($20 M), MacArthur ($20 M), Ashby ($18.5 M), Berkeley Downtown ($20 M).
 ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE D
Vote YES to help ensure that the sale or swap of any public parkland shall require approval of the voters.

Twenty years ago, Alamedans overwhelmingly approved a charter amendment banning the sale of City-owned parkland, including its municipal golf courses, without a vote of the people. However, the amendment contains an exception whereby parkland can be disposed of without voter approval. Council may decide to exchange a park for another piece of land. This Measure will eliminate that exception.

Recent events demonstrate why the loophole must be closed. Our Mif Albright par-3 golf course, where generations of young Alamedans learned the game, could have been exchanged by the City Council for property in a business park and cash. The developer intended to build 130 homes on our recreational land.

Fortunately, Alamedans young and old raised overwhelming public opposition and stopped “The Swap.” Yet, the resulting controversy distracted the work of city staff, Council, and citizens for years. And unless the loophole is closed — permanently — the battle may have to be fought again, perhaps in defense of another park.

The distinguished sponsors of the original charter amendment emphasized its intent — “to take out of the hands of politicians the ability to sell any of our precious public parks, golf courses and boating facilities and put any disposition of our parklands in the hands of you, the people.”

Any sale or exchange of parklands should require voter approval. Protect Alameda parks by voting YES on Measure D!

s/ Tony Corica
Alamedan
s/ Marie Kane
Business Woman
s/ Mike Robles-Wong
Community Advocate
s/ Norma Arnerich
Youth Sports Supporter
s/ Nick Cabral
Alamedan

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE D WAS SUBMITTED

JANET C. KERN
City Attorney
FULL TEXT OF MEASURE D
CITY OF ALAMEDA PARKS CHARTER
AMENDMENT FULL TEXT

A CHARTER AMENDMENT INITIATIVE TO PROTECT ALAMEDA CITY PARKS FROM BEING SOLD, SWAPPED, OR OTHERWISE ALIENATED EXCEPT PURSUANT TO THE AFFIRMATIVE VOTES OF THE MAJORITY OF THE ELECTORS

Section 1. TITLE
This Initiative shall be known and referred to as the “Protect Our Alameda Parks Initiative.”

Section 2. FINDINGS
1. The City’s public parks are a valuable community asset, contributing to the beauty, livability, health, fitness, and enjoyment of all of its citizens and residents.
2. The City’s electors previously have expressed their strong support for the preservation of the City’s public parks by overwhelmingly voting, in June of 1992, for Measure C, which prohibits the sale of the City’s public parks without approval by the majority of the electors, except under certain listed exceptions.
3. The City Manager has proposed to the City Council selling a portion of the Alameda Golf Complex in exchange for land in the Harbor Bay Business Park without seeking a vote of the electors on such a proposal.
4. Neither the City Manager nor more than one member of the City Council has acknowledged the requirement of the electors to approve or disapprove such a proposal pursuant to Article XXII, Section 22-12 of the City Charter.
5. In order to protect the City’s public parks from such proposals and litigation over the interpretation and enforcement of Article XXII, Section 22-12 of the City Charter, it is necessary to remove the “loophole” exception to the requirement that all sales of the City’s public parks require the approval of the majority of the electors.

Section 3. AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE XXII, SECTION 22-12 OF THE CITY CHARTER OF THE CITY OF ALAMEDA

Article XXII, Section 22-12 of the City Charter of the City of Alameda is hereby amended as follows:

Part (c) of the first sentence, and all of the second sentence, of Article XXII, Section 22-12 of the City Charter of the City of Alameda are hereby deleted in their entirety, such that Article XXII, Section 22-12 of the City Charter of the City of Alameda shall read as follows:

“Sec. 22-12. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Charter to the contrary, the public parks of the City shall not be sold or otherwise alienated except pursuant to the affirmative votes of the majority of the electors voting on such a proposition; except that the City Council may (a) lease or grant concessions or privileges in public parks or any portion thereof or building or structure situated therein, or (b) grant permits, licenses or easements for street, utility or any other purposes in public parks or any portion thereof or building or structure situated therein or (c) grant permits, licenses or easements for street, utility or any other purposes in public parks or any portion thereof or building or structure situated therein or (d) permit the City Manager to dispose of public parks without approval of the majority of the electors. In the event that the City Manager proposes to dispose of public parks or any portion thereof or building or structure situated therein or (e) sell or dispose of public parks or any portion thereof; after a public hearing or hearings in each case, the City Council determines that another new public park has been or will be designated by the City Council for public park purposes and opened to the public for public park purposes. The City Council shall determine that said “new public park” is of comparable size and utility and serves the same service area with substantially the same amenities and improvements. As used herein “public parks” means any and all lands of the City which have been or will be designated by City Council for public park purposes and/or recreational uses and opened to the public for public park purposes and/or recreational uses. “Public parks” also includes the Alameda Golf Complex.”

Section 4. EFFECTIVE DATE
This Charter Amendment shall become effective upon passage.

Section 5. CHARTER AMENDMENT LANGUAGE SUPERSEDES EXISTING CHARTER LANGUAGE
This Charter Amendment language supersedes any existing Charter language to the extent that such existing Charter language is in conflict with this Amendment.

Section 6. SEVERABILITY
It is the intent of the People that the provisions of this Charter Amendment are severable and that if any section or provision of this Amendment or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect any other provision or application of this Charter Amendment which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application.

Section 7. LIBERAL CONSTRUCTION
The provisions of this Charter Amendment shall be liberally construed to effectuate its purposes.

Section 8. CONFLICTING BALLOT MEASURES
In the event that this measure and another measure or measures relating to the City’s public parks appear on the same city-wide election ballot, the provisions of the other measure or measures shall be deemed to be in conflict with this measure. In the event that this measure receives a greater number of affirmative votes than the other measure or measures, the provisions of this measure shall prevail over conflicting provisions in any other measure, and the conflicting provisions of the other measure or measures shall be null and void.
To maintain and provide city services and facilities, including: Fire and Police protection, safety, and emergency response; Recreational programs, parks, playgrounds, and open space; Senior and youth programs and facilities; Community development and environmental preservation; And other general city services and facilities, Shall the City of Albany enact a one-half cent sales tax, with annual independent audits, to end after eight years, with all funds spent only in Albany?

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE F

Ballot Statement in Support of the Transactions and Use Tax to be Administered by the State Board of Equalization.

The City of Albany has worked hard to maintain fiscal stability, and has avoided the dire fiscal consequences other cities have faced. Early in the recession, Council and Staff instituted many belt-tightening steps. However, the deep and long economic recession has resulted in reduced financial resources available to local governments from State and Federal sources.

Staff and community workshops have generated ideas used to restructure many operations, reduce costs and make budget cuts. Cutting the number of employees, reducing compensation, sharing staff with other cities, and stretching dollars have already occurred.

Nevertheless, it is clear the City has reached capacity limitations that will cause it to fall short in meeting existing requirements and expectations: for example, falling behind in maintaining safe public facilities, keeping pace with mandates, safety concerns, technology updates, and filling positions that have remained empty for several years. These limitations compromise the quality of life and services that the Albany community receives.

While Albany has been very successful in obtaining grants, local matching funds are needed but are in short supply. Moreover, grants generally fund capital projects rather than the services of critical importance to the community.

The City of Albany has seen revenues flatten and decline – as much as $1,000,000 from some funding sources – or 6% of the budget - over the past several years. Because of current limitations and loss of revenue, the City Council is recommending voters approve a ½ cent sales tax that would expire after eight years.

With your support of this measure, Albany can continue to maintain and provide city services and facilities, including: Fire and Police protection, safety, and emergency response; recreational programs, parks, playgrounds, and open space; senior and youth programs and facilities; community development and environmental preservation; and other general city services.

We urge a YES vote on Measure F.

s/Farid Javandel
Albany Mayor
s/Marge Atkinson
Albany Vice Mayor
s/Jonathan Knight
Albany School Board Vice-President
s/Stephanie Sala
Small Business Owner
s/Jewel Okawachi
Former Albany Mayor

CITY OF ALBANY MEASURE F

YES
NO

CITY ATTORNEY’S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS
OF MEASURE F

The City Council has placed before the voters the question whether to approve an ordinance enacting a temporary transactions and use tax within the City of Albany to fund City services such as fire and police, parks and recreation, senior and youth programs and facilities, community development, environmental preservation, and other general City services and facilities. The tax rate would be one-half of one percent (0.50%) of the retail sales price, or one-half cent for an item that costs one dollar. The tax would remain in effect for eight years. A full copy of the ordinance text is printed in these ballot materials.

Technically, the existing “sales tax” is a combination of “sales and use tax” and “transactions and use tax.” Both are levied on the sale or use of tangible personal property sold at retail, with certain limited exceptions. Retailers collect the tax at the time of sale and remit the funds to the State Board of Equalization, which administers the tax.

Currently, the tax on retail sales in Albany is 8.75% of the purchase price. This measure would authorize a 0.50% transactions and use tax, which would increase the total sales tax rate to 9.25%. The tax would automatically terminate eight years after it becomes operative, unless extended by the voters.

The tax proceeds would be deposited into the City’s general fund and be available to support the full range of municipal services. Because this measure does not legally restrict the use of tax revenue to any specific purposes, it is classified as a “general tax,” not a “special tax.” The tax proceeds may be used for any valid municipal governmental purpose and cannot legally be taken away by the State.

This measure requires the City’s independent auditors to prepare an annual audit report reviewing the collection, management and expenditure of revenue from the tax. The audit report will be a matter of public record.

A “Yes” vote is a vote in favor of the tax. A “No” vote is a vote against the tax. This measure will be approved if it receives a simple majority of “Yes” votes.

DATED: August 10, 2012
s/CRAIG LABADIE
City Attorney

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE F WAS SUBMITTED
FULL TEXT OF MEASURE F
ORDINANCE NO. 2012-03

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF ALBANY
IMPOSING A TRANSACTIONS AND
USE TAX TO BE ADMINISTERED BY THE STATE
BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

WHEREAS, since 2009, the City of Albany has seen
its revenues flatten and decline, notably the annual real
property transfer tax revenue, which has declined by
approximately $1 million over the course of the past
several years; and

WHEREAS, the City Council and City staff have
restructured City operations, reduced costs, and made
budget cuts to adapt to diminishing financial resources; and

WHEREAS, the City currently has held vacant police
officer and public safety dispatcher positions as well as not
filling, restructuring, or eliminating positions in recreation
programming, public works, planning and administration; and

WHEREAS, to reduce expenses the City is sharing a
Fire Chief with the City of Piedmont and an Information
Technology Manager with the City of Emeryville; and

WHEREAS, take-home pay for most City employees
has dropped by four percent or more in the past year, all
employees in a pension program will have to pay the full
costs for the employee share of pension costs, and new
employees will receive lower pension benefits; and

WHEREAS, in 2011 the City conducted staff and
community workshops to generate ideas for reducing costs
or increasing revenues, then incorporated short-term ideas
into the 2011-12 budget and reviewed medium to long-
range ideas at a City Council meeting on November 21,
2011; and

WHEREAS, the City has worked hard to maintain
stability in the midst of the economic turmoil that has
reduced financial resources available to local governments
throughout the State and country; and

WHEREAS, at meetings in April 2012, the City Council
received a staff report documenting the capacity limitations
which are causing the City to fall short in meeting existing
requirements and expectations and to fall behind in
maintaining safe public facilities and keeping pace with
mandates, safety concerns, and changing demographics
and technology; and

WHEREAS, on the basis of the foregoing, the City Council
determined that the best option available to the City for
addressing these concerns is to request voter approval for a
Transactions and Use (Sales) Tax at the rate of one-half of
one percent (0.5%) to remain in effect for a period of eight
years; and

WHEREAS, the tax, if approved, would be imposed on
the sale of tangible personal property and the storage, use,
or other consumption of such property and the tax revenue
would be collected by the State Board of Equalization and
remitted to the City; and

WHEREAS, the proposed transactions and use tax to be
submitted to the voters is a general tax that can be used for
any legitimate governmental purpose; it is not a committed
to any particular purposes; and the specific purposes
recited in the ballot measure are for illustration only and
not a restriction or limitation on the use of tax proceeds;
and the measure shall be approved if it receives at least a
simple majority of affirmative votes.

NOW THEREFORE, THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF
ALBANY DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Article 4-12 is hereby added to Chapter IV of
the Albany Municipal Code, to read as follows:

4-12 TRANSACTIONS AND USE TAX

4-12.1 TITLE. This ordinance shall be known as the
City of Albany Transactions and Use Tax Ordinance. The
City of Albany hereinafter shall be called “City.” This
ordinance shall be applicable in the incorporated territory
of the City.

4-12.2 OPERATIVE DATE. “Operative Date” means
the first day of the first calendar quarter commencing more
than 110 days after the adoption of this ordinance, the date
of such adoption being as set forth below.

4-12.3 PURPOSE. This ordinance is adopted to
achieve the following, among other purposes, and directs
that the provisions hereof be interpreted in order to
accomplish those purposes:

A. To impose a retail transactions and use tax in
accordance with the provisions of Part 1.6 (commencing
with Section 7251) of Division 2 of the Revenue and
Taxation Code and Section 7285.9 of Part 1.7 of Division
2 which authorizes the City to adopt this tax ordinance
which shall be operative if a majority of the electors voting
on the measure vote to approve the imposition of the tax at
an election called for that purpose.

B. To adopt a retail transactions and use tax ordinance
that incorporates provisions identical to those of the Sales
and Use Tax Law of the State of California insofar as
those provisions are not inconsistent with the requirements
and limitations contained in Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the
Revenue and Taxation Code.

D. To adopt a retail transactions and use tax ordinance
that imposes a tax and provides a measure therefore
that can be administered and collected by the State
Board of Equalization in a manner that adapts itself as
fully as practicable to, and requires the least possible
deviation from, the existing statutory and administrative
procedures followed by the State Board of Equalization in
administering and collecting the California State Sales and
Use Taxes.

E. To adopt a retail transactions and use tax ordinance
that can be administered in a manner that will be, to the
greatest degree possible, consistent with the provisions
of Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation
Code, minimize the cost of collecting the transactions and
use taxes, and at the same time, minimize the burden of
record keeping upon persons subject to taxation under the
provisions of this ordinance.

4-12.4 CONTRACT WITH STATE. Prior to the
operative date, the City shall contract with the State Board of Equalization to perform all functions incident to the administration and operation of this transactions and use tax ordinance; provided, that if the City shall not have contracted with the State Board of Equalization prior to the operative date, it shall nevertheless so contract and in such a case the operative date shall be the first day of the first calendar quarter following the execution of such a contract.

4-12.5  TRANSACTIONS TAX RATE. For the privilege of selling tangible personal property at retail, a tax is hereby imposed upon all retailers in the incorporated territory of the City at the rate of 0.5% of the gross receipts of any retailer from the sale of all tangible personal property sold at retail in said territory on and after the operative date of this ordinance.

4-12.6  PLACE OF SALE. For the purposes of this ordinance, all retail sales are consummated at the place of business of the retailer unless the tangible personal property sold is delivered by the retailer or his agent to an out-of-state destination or to a common carrier for delivery to an out-of-state destination. The gross receipts from such sales shall include delivery charges, when such charges are subject to the state sales and use tax, regardless of the place to which delivery is made. In the event a retailer has no permanent place of business in the State or has more than one place of business, the place or places at which the retail sales are consummated shall be determined under rules and regulations to be prescribed and adopted by the State Board of Equalization.

4-12.7  USE TAX RATE. An excise tax is hereby imposed on the storage, use or other consumption in the City of tangible personal property purchased from any retailer on and after the operative date of this ordinance for storage, use or other consumption in said territory at the rate of 0.5% of the sales price of the property. The sales price shall include delivery charges when such charges are subject to state sales or use tax regardless of the place to which delivery is made.

4-12.8  ADOPTION OF PROVISIONS OF STATE LAW. Except as otherwise provided in this ordinance and except insofar as they are inconsistent with the provisions of Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, all of the provisions of Part 1 (commencing with Section 6001) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code are hereby adopted and made a part of this ordinance as though fully set forth herein.

4-12.9  LIMITATIONS ON ADOPTION OF STATE LAW AND COLLECTION OF USE TAXES. In adopting the provisions of Part 1 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code:

A. Wherever the State of California is named or referred to as the taxing agency, the name of this City shall be substituted therefor. However, the substitution shall not be made when:

1. The word “State” is used as a part of the title of the State Controller, State Treasurer, State Board of Control, State Board of Equalization, State Treasury, or the Constitution of the State of California;

2. The result of that substitution would require action to be taken by or against this City or any agency, officer, or employee thereof other than by or against the State Board of Equalization, in performing the functions incident to the administration or operation of this Ordinance.

3. In those sections, including, but not necessarily limited to sections referring to the exterior boundaries of the State of California, where the result of the substitution would be to:

   a. Provide an exemption from this tax with respect to certain sales, storage, use or other consumption of tangible personal property which would not otherwise be exempt from this tax while such sales, storage, use or other consumption remain subject to tax by the State under the provisions of Part 1 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, or;

   b. Impose this tax with respect to certain sales, storage, use or other consumption of tangible personal property which would not be subject to tax by the state under the said provision of that code.

4. In Sections 6701, 6702 (except in the last sentence thereof), 6711, 6715, 6737, 6797 or 6828 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

B. The word “City” shall be substituted for the word “State” in the phrase “retailer engaged in business in this State” in Section 6203 and in the definition of that phrase in Section 6203.

4-12.10  PERMIT NOT REQUIRED. If a seller’s permit has been issued to a retailer under Section 6067 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, an additional transactor’s permit shall not be required by this ordinance.

4-12.11  EXEMPTIONS AND EXCLUSIONS.

A. There shall be excluded from the measure of the transactions tax and the use tax the amount of any sales tax or use tax imposed by the State of California or by any city, city and county, or county pursuant to the Bradley-Burns Uniform Local Sales and Use Tax Law or the amount of any state-administered transactions or use tax.

B. There are exempted from the computation of the amount of transactions tax the gross receipts from:

1. Sales of tangible personal property, other than fuel or petroleum products, to operators of aircraft to be used or consumed principally outside the county in which the sale is made and directly and exclusively in the use of such aircraft as common carriers of persons or property under the authority of the laws of this State, the United States, or any foreign government.

2. Sales of property to be used outside the City which is shipped to a point outside the City, pursuant to the contract of sale, by delivery to such point by the retailer or his agent, or by delivery by the retailer to a carrier for shipment to a consignee at such point. For the purposes of this paragraph, delivery to a point outside the City shall be satisfied:
With respect to vehicles (other than commercial vehicles) subject to registration pursuant to Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 4000) of Division 3 of the Vehicle Code, aircraft licensed in compliance with Section 21411 of the Public Utilities Code, and undocumented vessels registered under Division 3.5 (commencing with Section 9840) of the Vehicle Code by registration to an out-of-City address and by a declaration under penalty of perjury, signed by the buyer, stating that such address is, in fact, his or her principal place of residence; and

b. With respect to commercial vehicles, by registration to a place of business out-of-City and declaration under penalty of perjury, signed by the buyer, that the vehicle will be operated from that address.

3. The sale of tangible personal property if the seller is obligated to furnish the property for a fixed price pursuant to a contract entered into prior to the operative date of this ordinance.

4. A lease of tangible personal property which is a continuing sale of such property, for any period of time for which the lessor is obligated to lease the property for an amount fixed by the lease prior to the operative date of this ordinance.

5. For the purposes of subparagraphs (3) and (4) of this section, the sale or lease of tangible personal property shall be deemed not to be obligated pursuant to a contract or lease for any period of time for which any party to the contract or lease has the unconditional right to terminate the contract or lease upon notice, whether or not such right is exercised.

C. There are exempted from the use tax imposed by this ordinance, the storage, use or other consumption in this City of tangible personal property:

1. The gross receipts from the sale of which have been subject to a transactions tax under any state-administered transactions and use tax ordinance.

2. Other than fuel or petroleum products purchased by operators of aircraft and used or consumed by such operators directly and exclusively in the use of such aircraft as common carriers of persons or property for hire or compensation under a certificate of public convenience and necessity issued pursuant to the laws of this State, the United States, or any foreign government. This exemption is in addition to the exemptions provided in Sections 6366 and 6366.1 of the Revenue and Taxation Code of the State of California.

3. If the purchaser is obligated to purchase the property for a fixed price pursuant to a contract entered into prior to the operative date of this ordinance.

4. If the possession of, or the exercise of any right or power over, the tangible personal property arises under a lease which is a continuing purchase of such property for any period of time for which the lessee is obligated to lease the property for an amount fixed by a lease prior to the operative date of this ordinance.

5. For the purposes of subparagraphs (3) and (4) of this section, storage, use, or other consumption, or possession of, or exercise of any right or power over, tangible personal property shall be deemed not to be obligated pursuant to a contract or lease for any period of time for which any party to the contract or lease has the unconditional right to terminate the contract or lease upon notice, whether or not such right is exercised.

6. Except as provided in subparagraph (7), a retailer engaged in business in the City shall not be required to collect use tax from the purchaser of tangible personal property, unless the retailer ships or delivers the property into the City or participates within the City in making the sale of the property, including, but not limited to, soliciting or receiving the order, either directly or indirectly, at a place of business of the retailer in the City or through any representative, agent, canvasser, solicitor, subsidiary, or person in the City under the authority of the retailer.

7. “A retailer engaged in business in the City” shall also include any retailer of any of the following: vehicles subject to registration pursuant to Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 4000) of Division 3 of the Vehicle Code, aircraft licensed in compliance with Section 21411 of the Public Utilities Code, or undocumented vessels registered under Division 3.5 (commencing with Section 9840) of the Vehicle Code. That retailer shall be required to collect use tax from any purchaser who registers or licenses the vehicle, vessel, or aircraft at an address in the City.

D. Any person subject to use tax under this ordinance may credit against that tax any transactions tax or reimbursement for transactions tax paid to a district imposing, or retailer liable for a transactions tax pursuant to Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code with respect to the sale to the person of the property the storage, use or other consumption of which is subject to the use tax.

4-12.12 AMENDMENTS. All amendments subsequent to the effective date of this ordinance to Part 1 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code relating to sales and use taxes and which are not inconsistent with Part 1.6 and Part 1.7 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, and all amendments to Part 1.6 and Part 1.7 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, shall automatically become a part of this ordinance, provided however, that no such amendment shall operate so as to affect the rate of tax imposed by this ordinance.

4-12.13 ENJOINING COLLECTION FORBIDDEN. No injunction or writ of mandate or other legal or equitable process shall issue in any suit, action or proceeding in any court against the State or the City, or against any officer of the State or the City, to prevent or enjoin the collection under this ordinance, or Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, of any tax or any amount of tax required to be collected.

4-12.14 ANNUAL AUDIT. By no later than December 31st of each year after the operative date, the City’s independent auditors shall complete a report reviewing the collection, management and expenditure of revenue from
the tax levied by this Article.

4-12.15 SEVERABILITY. If any provision of this ordinance or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the ordinance and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

4-12.16 EFFECTIVE DATE. This ordinance relates to the levying and collecting of the City transactions and use taxes and shall take effect immediately.

4-12.17 TERMINATION DATE. The authority to levy the tax imposed by this ordinance shall expire eight (8) years after the first tax is collected.

Section 2. The People of the City of Albany find that all Recitals contained in this Ordinance are true and correct and are incorporated herein by reference.

Section 3. The findings for this ordinance in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) are the same as those set forth in the City’s Resolution No. 2012-42 calling for an election on this Ordinance. The CEQA findings set forth in Resolution No. 2012-42 are incorporated herein by reference.

Section 4. If any provision of this Ordinance or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Ordinance and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Section 5. This Ordinance relates to the levying and collection of the City Transactions and Use Taxes and shall take effect immediately.

Ordinance No. 2012-03 was submitted to the People of the City of Albany at the November 6, 2012 general municipal election. It was approved by the following vote of the People:

YES:

NO:

Ordinance No. 2012-03 was thereby adopted by the voters at the November 6, 2012 election and took effect upon adoption of a resolution declaring the results of the election at a regular meeting of the City Council held on ____________, 2012, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of an ordinance duly and regularly adopted by the People of the City of Albany, California.

______________________________
Nicole Almaguer, City Clerk
CHABOT-LAS POSITAS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT MEASURE I

"To provide Chabot and Las Positas Community Colleges funds that cannot be taken by the state, ensure affordable quality education, prepare students for university transfer, maintain job training in healthcare, technology, public safety, and other areas, uphold core academics, and preserve student support services, shall Chabot-Las Positas Community College District levy $28 per parcel annually for six years with Citizens’ Oversight, no money for permanent salaries, and all funds spent on local colleges?"

YES

NO

COUNTY COUNSEL’S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE I

ANALYSIS BY THE COUNTY COUNSEL OF A CHABOT-LAS POSITAS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT SPECIAL PARCEL TAX MEASURE

Measure I is a Chabot-Las Positas Community College District (“District”) special parcel tax measure. Measure I seeks voter approval of a special parcel tax on all parcels for a period of six years, beginning July 1, 2013. This measure would levy twenty-eight dollars ($28.00) on each parcel within the District annually. The measure defines “parcel” as any parcel of land that lies wholly or partially within the District’s boundaries that receives a separate tax bill for \textit{ad valorem} property taxes.

Community college districts have the authority to levy special taxes upon approval by two-thirds of the votes cast on the special tax proposals pursuant to the provisions of Article XIIIA, Section 4 of the California Constitution and Sections 50075-50077, 50079.1, and 53722 of the California Government Code.

If two-thirds of the qualified electors voting on this measure vote for approval, the special tax described above will be imposed annually for six years. The tax will be collected by the Alameda County Treasurer-Tax Collector and Contra Costa County Treasurer-Tax Collector, depending on where the parcel is located, at the same time and in the same manner as \textit{ad valorem} property taxes are collected.

If this measure passes, the funding revenue will be used for the specific purposes set forth in the full text of the measure printed in this sample ballot, including: updating classroom technology; maintaining core academic classes, such as math, science, and English; preserving student support services; and preparing students to transfer to four-year universities. The measure provides that the monies collected shall be accounted for separately and shall be expended only for those specified purposes. The monies collected will not be used to pay administrators’ salaries or benefits. An independent citizens’ oversight committee shall monitor the expenditures of the monies and shall report annually to the community.

If two-thirds of the qualified electors voting on this measure do not vote for approval, the measure will fail, and the District will not be authorized to levy the special tax.

s/DONNA R. ZIEGLER
County Counsel

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure I, which is printed in full in this sample ballot pamphlet. If you desire an additional copy of the measure, please call the Elections Official’s office at (510) 272-6933 and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you. You may also access the full text of the measure on the Alameda County website at the following address: www.acgov.org/rov/.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE I

We strongly urge you to vote Yes on Measure I for Chabot College and Las Positas College.

Because State budget cuts have slashed funding for our local community colleges, thousands of local students are being turned away from the classes they need to transfer to a four-year university or to prepare for their careers.

Measure I will ensure that the students at Chabot College and Las Positas College get the core classes they need to succeed.

Chabot College and Las Positas College are vital to the higher education of our community. They serve as safety nets for our local students, providing access to college courses that many might otherwise be unable to afford.

Measure I will allow Chabot College and Las Positas College to remain a leading source of training our community for jobs of the 21st Century.

Measure I will allow Chabot College and Las Positas College to:

• Protect core academic programs in science, math and English
• Restore funding to increase access to classes and lab offerings
• Update classroom technology
• Maintaining student support services
• Maintain and enhance job training programs to prepare adults for jobs in the new economy

With Measure I:

• Every penny will stay at Chabot College and Las Positas College
• Funds cannot be taken away by the State
• Independent citizens’ oversight will ensure that funds are spent as promised
• No funds will be used for administrators’ salaries

Please join us in supporting Measure I to give Chabot College and Las Positas College the resources to restore core programs and classes and remain a vital local educational source.

s/Ellen M. Corbett
California State Senator
s/Dale Eldridge Kays
President/CEO Livermore Valley Chamber of Commerce
s/Patrick M. Lofft
Member Alameda Tax Payer Association; Accountant
s/Janet Lockhart
Las Positas Foundation Board Past Chair, Former Dublin Mayor
s/Francisco Zermeño
Hayward City Councilman, Professor, Chabot College
INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

To protect Chabot College and Las Positas College from State budget cuts, provide local funding that cannot be taken away by the State and preserve affordable, quality education for students, Chabot-Las Positas Community College District proposes to establish an education parcel tax for a period of six years, beginning July 1, 2013, at the rate of $28 per year, on each assessor’s parcel located within the Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, and to implement accountability measures in connection with the temporary levy to ensure the funds are used to:

(a) update classrooms technology;
(b) maintain core academic classes such as math, science, and English;
(c) attract and retain high quality teachers;
(d) restore funding to increase the number of classes and lab offerings;
(e) prepare students to transfer to four-year colleges and universities in a timely manner;
(f) maintain job training programs to help prepare adults for 21st Century jobs; and
(g) preserve student support services.

AMOUNT OF EDUCATION PARCEL TAX; PERIOD OF ASSESSMENT

The education parcel tax shall be $28 (or less as provided below) per year for six (6) full years assessed against each parcel. The proceeds of the education parcel tax shall be deposited into a separate account created by the District.

DEFINITION OF “PARCEL”

For purposes of the special tax, the term “Parcel” means any parcel of land which lies wholly or partially within the boundaries of the Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, that receives a separate tax bill for ad valorem property taxes from either the Alameda County or Contra Costa County Assessor/Tax Collector’s office. All property that is otherwise exempt from or upon which are levied no ad valorem property taxes in any year shall also be exempt from the education parcel tax in such year.

For purposes of this special tax, any such “Parcels” which are (i) contiguous, (ii) used solely for owner-occupied, single-family residential purposes, and (iii) held under identical ownership may, by the owner submitting evidence of such facts by June 15 of any year to the Board of Trustees of the Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, be treated as a single “parcel” for purposes of the levy of this education parcel tax.

REDUCTION IN TAX IF RESULT IS LESS OTHER GOVERNMENT SUPPORT

The collection of the education parcel tax is not intended to decrease or offset any increase in local, state or federal government sources that would otherwise be available to the Chabot-Las Positas Community College District during the period of the education parcel tax. In the event that the levy and collection does have such an effect, the Chabot-Las Positas Community College District shall cease the levy or shall reduce the education parcel tax to the extent that such action would restore the amount of the decrease or offset in other revenues.

EXEMPTIONS FROM THE TAX

Current applicable California law does not provide any exemptions from the payment of the educational parcel tax, including exemptions for owners of parcels who are either 65 years of age or older or receive Supplemental Social Security income for a disability, regardless of age. However, in the event applicable law changes during the term of this educational parcel tax, the District intends to grant both seniors and disabled persons receiving SSI an exemption, to the extent legally permissible.

ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES

In accordance with the requirements of California Government Code Sections 50075.1 and 50075.3, the following accountability measures, among others, shall apply to the education parcel tax levied in accordance with this Measure: (a) the specific purposes of the education parcel tax shall be those purposes identified above; (b) the proceeds of the education parcel tax shall be applied only to those specific purposes identified above; (c) a separate, special account shall be created into which the proceeds of the education parcel tax must be deposited; and (d) an annual written report shall be made to the Board of Trustees of the District showing (i) the amount of funds collected and expended from the proceeds of the education parcel tax and (ii) the status of any projects or programs required or authorized to be funded from the proceeds of the education parcel tax, as identified above.

Under no circumstances shall any of the proceeds of the educational special parcel tax be used for administrators’ salaries or benefits. Parcel tax proceeds shall only be spent for Chabot College and Las Positas College.

CITIZEN OVERSIGHT

In addition to the accountability measures required by State law, an Oversight Committee shall be appointed by the Board of Trustees to monitor the expenditures of these funds by the District and will report on an annual basis to the Board and community on how these funds have been spent.
COUNTY COUNSEL'S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF BOND MEASURE J

ANALYSIS BY THE COUNTY COUNSEL OF AN OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT BOND MEASURE

Measure J, an Oakland Unified School District (“District”) bond measure, seeks voter approval to authorize the District to issue and sell bonds of up to four hundred seventy-five million dollars ($475,000,000.00) in aggregate principal amount. The primary purpose of the bonds is to finance school facilities projects as specified in the measure.

Pursuant to California Constitution Section 18 of Article XVI and Section 1 of Article XIII A and California Education Code Section 15274, this measure will become effective upon the affirmative vote of at least 55% of the qualified electors voting on this measure.

California Education Code Section 15100 restricts the use of the proceeds from the bonds sale to construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation or replacement of school facilities, and the acquisition of real property for school facilities. In addition, proceeds may only be used for the projects listed in the measure. This measure provides that its proceeds will fund projects outlined in the measure (reproduced in the sample ballot pamphlet) that include district-wide and site specific projects. The district-wide projects include, among others, repairing existing school sites, seismic retrofits, upgrading school facilities, and improving energy efficiency. The site-specific projects include similar improvements at specific schools throughout the district. Proceeds may not be used for any other purpose, such as administrator salaries.

If 55% of those who vote on the measure vote “yes”, the District will be authorized to issue bonds of up to four hundred seventy-five million dollars ($475,000,000.00). Approval of this measure will authorize a levy on the assessed value of taxable property within the District by an amount needed to pay the principal and interest on these bonds in each year that the bonds are outstanding.

The Tax Rate Statement for Measure J in this sample ballot pamphlet reflects the District’s best estimates, based upon currently available data and projections, of the property tax rates required to service the bonds. The best estimate of the maximum tax rate required to be levied to fund the bonds after the sale of the first series is no more than 3.9¢ (three and nine-tenths cents) per $100.00 (one hundred dollars), which is $39.00 (thirty-nine dollars) per $100,000.00 (one hundred thousand dollars), of the assessed valuation in the fiscal year 2013-2014. The best estimate of the maximum tax rate required to be levied to fund the bonds after the sale of the last series is no more than 6¢ (six cents) per $100.00 (one hundred dollars), which is $60.00 (sixty dollars) per $100,000.00 (one hundred thousand dollars), of the assessed valuation in the fiscal year 2019-2020.

An independent citizens’ oversight committee will monitor the bond expenditures.

If 55% of those voting on this measure do not vote for approval, the measure will fail and the District will not be authorized to issue the bonds.

s/DONNA R. ZIEGLER
County Counsel

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure J, which is printed in full in this sample ballot pamphlet. If you desire an additional copy of the measure, please call the Elections Official’s office at (510) 272-6933 and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you. You may also access the full text of the measure on the Alameda County website at the following address: www.acgov.org/rov/.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF BOND MEASURE J

Measure J is about one thing: Improving the Quality of Oakland schools.

While there has been significant progress in the quality of our local schools over the past few years, the facts remain that many of Oakland’s schools need improvement and not every Oakland child has a safe school and a well-functioning classroom.

The average age of Oakland schools is 71 years. Schools built years ago need significant updating; classrooms are inadequate, roofs need repair, plumbing and heating systems are deteriorating, and many classrooms have inadequate lighting, wiring and electrical outlets.

When repairs involve breaking through walls and ceilings, asbestos is often found, making even minor problems expensive to fix.

Measure J has been placed on the ballot to address the most pressing needs. Measure J will provide funding to upgrade classrooms, computer systems and science labs. Measure J insures that our schools have the facilities needed to provide career training and advanced courses in math, science and technology.

All money raised by Measure J will stay in our community to benefit Oakland children. No money can be taken by the state or used for other purposes. Cost of Measure J is tax deductible. Independent audits ensure money will be spent as promised. Measure J will help qualify our community for state matching funds, when available.

Among the projects that will be completed:

- Seismic upgrades of schools and classrooms to reduce danger from earthquakes
- Asbestos and lead paint removal
- Upgrade science labs, classrooms, computers and technology
- Repair bathrooms and unsafe playground areas
- Upgrade kitchen facilities to improve nutrition and nutritional education

Improving our local schools is essential for our children and to attract jobs and stimulate economic growth in Oakland. Business, labor, teachers, parents, principals, community and religious leaders are all supporting Measure J. Please vote YES on Measure J.

s/Renee Swayne
Retired Teacher & Chair, Measure B Oversight Committee

s/Beverly Rivas
Executive Director, OBA

s/Jonathan Klein
Executive Director, Great Oakland Public Schools

s/Ruth Woodruff
Parent and Co-Founder, Oakland School Food Alliance

s/Jesus Nieto-Ruiz
Pastor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST BOND MEASURE J WAS SUBMITTED
FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURE J
BOND AUTHORIZATION

By approval of this proposition by at least 55% of the registered voters voting on the proposition, the Oakland Unified School District (the “District”) shall be authorized to issue and sell bonds of up to $475,000,000 in aggregate principal amount to provide financing for the specific school facilities projects listed in the Bond Project List below, and in order to qualify to receive State matching grant funds, subject to all of the accountability safeguards specified below.

ACCOUNTABILITY SAFEGUARDS

The provisions in this section are specifically included in this proposition in order that the District’s voters and taxpayers may be assured that their money will be spent wisely to address specific facilities needs of the District, all in compliance with the requirements of Article XIII A, Section 1(b)(3) of the State Constitution, and the Strict Accountability in Local School Construction Bonds Act of 2000 (codified at Education Code Sections 15264 and following).

Evaluation of Needs. The Board of Education hereby certifies that it has evaluated the facilities needs of the District, and the priority of addressing each of these needs. The results of the Board of Education’s evaluation and its priorities are articulated in the District’s Facilities Master Plan, adopted by the Board and dated May 22, 2012. In the course of its evaluation, the Board of Education took safety, class size reduction and information technology needs into consideration while developing the Facilities Master Plan and the Bond Project List.

Limitation on Use of Bond Proceeds. The State of California does not have the power to take locally approved school district bond funds for any State purposes. The Constitution allows proceeds from the sale of bonds authorized by this proposition to be used only for the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of school facilities listed in this proposition, including the furnishing and equipping of school facilities, or the acquisition or lease of real property for school facilities, and not for any other purpose, including teacher and administrator salaries and other school operating expenses. Proceeds of the bonds may be used to pay or reimburse the District for the cost of District staff only when performing work on or necessary and incidental to the bond projects.

Independent Citizens’ Oversight Committee. The Board of Education shall establish an independent Citizens’ Oversight Committee (pursuant to Education Code Section 15278 and following), to ensure bond proceeds are spent only for the school facilities projects listed in the Bond Project List. The committee shall be established within 60 days of the date on which the Board of Education enters the election results on its minutes.

Annual Performance Audits. The Board of Education shall conduct an annual, independent performance audit to ensure that the bond proceeds have been expended only on the school facilities projects listed in the Bond Project List.

Annual Financial Audits. The Board of Education shall conduct an annual, independent financial audit of the bond proceeds (which shall be separate from the District’s regular annual financial audit) until all of those proceeds have been spent for the school facilities projects listed in the Bond Project List.

Special Bond Proceeds Account; Annual Report to Board. Upon approval of this proposition and the sale of any bonds approved, the Board of Education shall take actions necessary pursuant to Government Code Section 53410 and following to establish an account in which proceeds of the sale of bonds will be deposited. As long as any proceeds of the bonds remain unexpended, the Superintendent or the Deputy Superintendent, Business Services and Operations of the District (or such other employee as may perform substantially similar duties) shall cause a report to be filed with the Board no later than December 31 of each year, commencing December 31, 2012, stating (1) the amount of bond proceeds received and expended in that year, and (2) the status of any project funded or to be funded from bond proceeds. The report may relate to the calendar year, fiscal year, or other appropriate annual period as such officer shall determine, and may be incorporated into the annual budget, audit, or other appropriate routine report to the Board.

FURTHER SPECIFICATIONS

Specific Purposes. All of the purposes enumerated in this proposition shall be united and voted upon as one single proposition, pursuant to Education Code Section 15100, and shall constitute the specific purposes of the bonds, and proceeds of the bonds shall be spent only for such purposes, pursuant to Government Code Section 53410.

Joint Use. The District may enter into agreements with the County of Alameda or other public agencies or nonprofit organizations for joint use of school facilities financed with the proceeds of the bonds in accordance with Education Code Section 17077.42 (or any successor provision). The District may seek State grant funds for eligible joint-use projects as permitted by law, and this proposition hereby specifies and acknowledges that bond funds will or may be used to fund all or a portion of the local share for any eligible joint-use projects identified in the Bond Project List or as otherwise permitted by California State regulations, as the Board of Education shall determine.

Rate of Interest. The bonds shall bear interest at a rate per annum not exceeding the statutory maximum, payable at the time or times permitted by law.

Term of Bonds. The number of years the whole or any part of the bonds are to run shall not exceed the legal limit, though this shall not preclude bonds from being sold which mature prior to the legal limit.

BOND PROJECT LIST

The Bond Project List below describes the specific projects the Oakland Unified School District proposes to finance with proceeds of the bonds. Listed projects
will be completed as needed at a particular school site according to Board-established priorities, and the order in which such projects appear on the Bond Project List is not an indication of priority for funding or completion. The final cost of each project will be determined as plans are finalized, construction bids are awarded, and projects are completed. Certain construction funds expected from non-bond sources, including State grant funds for eligible projects, have not yet been secured. Until all project costs and funding sources are known, the Board of Education cannot determine the amount of bond proceeds available to be spent on each project, nor guarantee that the bonds will provide sufficient funds to allow completion of all listed projects. Completion of some projects may be subject to further government approvals by State officials and boards, to local environmental review, and to input from the public. For these reasons, inclusion of a project on the Bond Project List is not a guarantee that the project will be funded or completed. The Board of Education may make changes to the Bond Project List in the future consistent with the projects specified in the proposition.

Part I: District-wide authorization: the projects in this part are authorized to be completed at each or any of the District’s sites, as shall be approved by the Board of Education. The examples under each project type do not form an exhaustive list.

• Construct, equip, furnish, repair and rehabilitate existing school sites to create a Full Service Community School District, including:
  o Dedicated space for early childhood development,
  o Private rooms for family counseling,
  o Childhood Development Centers,
  o Clinics for school health centers,
  o Expand and modify sites that accommodate more grade levels,
  o Improved community access to classrooms, auditoriums, multipurpose rooms, and other spaces,
  o Equip spaces for Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) programs.

• Enhance seismic safety, including:
  o Seismic retrofits.

• Upgrade and modernize school facilities, including mechanical, electrical and structural elements of permanent buildings, and improve safety, building performance, and accessibility including:
  o repairing, rehabilitating and acquiring HVAC systems, roofs, plumbing and electrical systems,
  o upgrading accessibility, improving or acquiring technology and technology infrastructure,
  o acquiring, replacing and upgrading security systems and fire alarm systems,
  o removing portable classrooms and replacing them with permanent buildings,
  o improving school grounds,
  o renovating and/or constructing central, on-site, and community kitchens,
  o constructing, renovating, and replacing school playgrounds, educational gardens, tracks and fields;
  o constructing and repairing landscaping and paving, and installing improvements such as sun-shades.

• Improve energy efficiency, renewable power generation, and sustainability including:
  o installation of photovoltaic panels,
  o upgrading lighting, lighting technology, and other lighting control systems,
  o install window shades, or daylighting enhancements,
  o install / upgrade insulation,
  o perform mechanical system repairs, replacements, and upgrades
  o install and/or upgrade automatic control systems,
  o remediate storm water impacts,
  o other resource usage reduction initiatives, and
  o reduce light pollution.

• Increase utilization of under-used assets, including:
  o redeveloping administrative sites and inactive school sites,
  o reconfiguring inactive school sites for alternative uses such as teacher housing, alternative academics, and training,
  o reconfiguration of sites or parts of sites to house administrative functions, and
  o optimizing active school sites to host community partners.

• Technological and facilities improvements to support student learning & instruction, including:
  o Acquiring, modernizing or replacing classroom and instructional technology required for 21st century student learning and teaching,
  o Upgrading and expanding classrooms, labs, and specialized facilities for career and vocational technology programs,
  o Constructing, rehabilitating and modernizing classrooms, labs, and specialized facilities for high school students, and
  o Upgrading, replacing, repairing or
acquiring electrical capacity and aging wiring to support instructional technology.

**Part II:** Site-specific authorization: the following projects are authorized at the specific sites indicated below (and are supplemental to, and do not limit the authorization set forth in, Part I).

- **Washington Elementary School (581 6st Street)**
  - Expand and modify sites that accommodate more grade levels (K-8),
  - Upgrade and modernize school facilities, including mechanical, electrical and structural elements of permanent buildings, and improve safety, building performance, and accessibility,
  - Improve energy efficiency and renewable power generation, including the installation of solar panels,
  - Enhance seismic safety.

- **McClymonds High School (2608 Myrtle Street)**
  - Upgrade and modernize school facilities, including mechanical, electrical and structural elements of permanent buildings, and improve safety, building performance, and accessibility,
  - Turf field replacement,
  - Improve energy efficiency and renewable power generation, including the installation of solar panels,
  - Enhance seismic safety,
  - Equip spaces for Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) programs.

- **Foster Elementary School (2850 West Street)**
  - Convert site into a central commissary including a central kitchen, a farm produce receiving and handling center, a demonstration farm, and a food education center,
  - Enhance seismic safety.

- **Fremont Federation School (4610 Foothill)**
  - Upgrade and modernize school facilities, including mechanical, electrical and structural elements of permanent buildings, and improve safety, building performance, and accessibility,
  - Turf field replacement,
  - Improve energy efficiency and renewable power generation, including the installation of solar panels,
  - Enhance seismic safety.
  - Construct sports complex.

- **Glenview Elementary (4215 La Cresta Avenue)**
  - Remove portable classrooms and replace them with permanent buildings,
  - Enhance seismic safety.

- **Skyline High School (12250 Skyline Blvd)**
  - Upgrade and modernize school facilities, including mechanical, electrical and structural elements of permanent buildings, and improve safety, building performance, and accessibility,
  - Repair and improve paving on roads and paths on campus,
  - Turf field replacement,
  - Improve energy efficiency and renewable power generation, including the installation of solar panels,
  - Enhance seismic safety,
  - Equip spaces for Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) programs.

- **Webster Academy (8000 Birch Street)**
  - Childhood Development Center replacement.

- **Whittier Elementary School (6328 East 17th Street)**
  - Expand and modify sites that accommodate more grade levels (K-8),
  - Remove portable classrooms and replace them with permanent buildings,
  - Enhance seismic safety.

- **Sobrante Park Elementary School (470 El Paseo Drive)**
  - Upgrade and modernize school facilities, including mechanical, electrical and structural elements of permanent buildings, and improve safety, building performance, and accessibility,
  - Turf field replacement,
  - Improve energy efficiency and renewable power generation, including the installation of solar panels,
  - Enhance seismic safety,
  - Equip spaces for Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) programs.

- **Madison Middle School (400 Capistrano Drive)**
  - Expand and modify sites that accommodate more grade levels (6-12)
  - Construct sports complex.

Each project listed is assumed to include its share of costs of the election and bond issuance and other construction-related costs, such as construction management, architectural, engineering, inspection and other planning costs, legal, accounting and similar fees, independent annual financial and performance audits, a customary construction contingency, and other costs incidental to and necessary for completion of the listed projects (whether work is performed by the District or by
third parties), including:

- Remove, dispose of, and otherwise remediate hazardous materials, including asbestos, lead, etc., where necessary.

- Address unforeseen conditions revealed by construction/modernization (including plumbing or gas line breaks, dry rot, seismic, structural, etc.).

- Site preparation/restoration in connection with new construction, renovation or remodeling, or installation or removal of relocatable classrooms, including ingress and egress, demolition of existing structures, removing, replacing, or installing irrigation and drainage, utility lines (such as gas lines, water lines, electrical lines, sewer lines, and communication lines), trees and landscaping, relocating fire access roads, traffic lights and mitigation, and acquiring any necessary easements, licenses, or rights of way to the property.

- Rental or construction of storage facilities and other space on an interim basis, as needed to accommodate construction materials, equipment, and personnel, and interim classrooms (including relocatables) for students and school functions or other storage for classroom materials displaced during construction.

- Acquisition of any of the facilities on the Bond Project List through temporary lease or lease-purchase arrangements, or execute purchase option under a lease for any of these authorized facilities.

- Furnishing and equipping of existing and newly constructed, modernized or rehabilitated classrooms and facilities on an ongoing basis, including to replace worn, broken, or out-of-date furniture and equipment for all classrooms, athletic facilities and other facilities, as needed.

- For any project involving renovation, modernization, remodeling or rehabilitation of a building or the major portion of a building, the District may proceed with new replacement construction instead (including any necessary demolition), if the Board of Education determines that replacement and new construction is more practical than rehabilitation and renovation, considering the building’s age, condition, expected remaining life, comparative cost, and other relevant factors.

- The Bond Project List shall be considered a part of this ballot proposition, and shall be reproduced in any official document required to contain the full statement of the bond proposition.

EXHIBIT B
TAX RATE STATEMENT FOR BOND MEASURE J

An election will be held in the Oakland Unified School District (the “District”) on November 6, 2012, to authorize the sale of up to $475,000,000 in bonds of the District to finance school facilities as described in the measure. If the bonds are approved, the District plans to sell the bonds in 4 series over a period of approximately 6 years. Principal and interest on the bonds will be payable from the proceeds of tax levies made upon the taxable property in the District.

The information presented in numbered paragraphs 1-3 below is provided in compliance with Sections 9400-9404 of the Elections Code of the State of California.

1. The best estimate of the maximum tax rate which would be required to be levied to fund this bond issue during the first fiscal year after the sale of the first series of bonds, based on estimated assessed valuations available at the time of filing of this statement, is no more than three and nine-tenths cents per $100 ($39 per $100,000) of assessed valuation in fiscal year 2013-14.

2. The best estimate of the maximum tax rate which would be required to be levied to fund this bond issue during the first fiscal year after the sale of the last series of bonds, based on estimated assessed valuations available at the time of filing of this statement, is no more than six cents per $100 ($60 per $100,000) of assessed valuation in fiscal year 2019-20.

3. The best estimate of the highest tax rate which would be required to be levied to fund this bond issue, based on estimated assessed valuations available at the time of filing of this statement, is six cents per $100 ($60 per $100,000) of assessed valuation, which is estimated to apply in fiscal year 2019-20.

Approval of the ballot measure authorizes the issuance of bonds under certain conditions, and is not approval of a specific tax rate or a specific bond issuance plan. The tax rate estimates in this statement reflect the District’s current projection of future assessed values and of future debt service payments, which are based on certain assumptions. The actual tax rates and the years in which they will apply may vary from those presently estimated, due to variations from these estimates in the timing of bond sales, the amount and repayment structure of bonds sold, market interest rates at the time of each sale, and actual assessed valuations over the term of repayment of the bonds. The dates of sale of the bonds and the amount and repayment structure of bonds sold at any given time will be determined by the District based on its need for construction funds, its intention to meet the tax rate targets stated above, the legal limitations on bonds approved by a 55% vote, and other factors. The actual interest rates at which the bonds are sold will depend on the bond market at the time of each sale. Actual future assessed valuation will depend upon the amount and value of taxable property within the District as determined by the County Assessor in the annual assessment and the equalization process.

Voters should note that the estimated tax rates are based on the ASSESSED VALUE of taxable property in the District as shown on the County’s official tax rolls, not on the property’s market value. Property owners should consult their own property tax bills to determine their property’s assessed value and any applicable tax exemptions.

Dated:  June 27, 2012.

I attest that the historical assessed value data used as a basis of these estimates are accurate.
s/Ron Thomsen
Assessor
Alameda County
s/Anthony Smith
Superintendent
Oakland Unified School District
Measure K is an Ohlone Community College District (“District”) measure submitted pursuant to California Education Code section 5020. The measure comes to the ballot as a result of actions taken by the Alameda County Board of Education, which is also the Alameda County Committee on School District Organization.

Currently, the District’s governing board elections are “at-large,” meaning that all registered voters of the District vote for all candidates of the District’s governing board. The District is comprised of two trustee areas. Area 1 represents the City of Newark, as well as the Fremont and Union City precincts west of I-880. Area 2 represents the Fremont and Union City precincts east of I-880.

This measure seeks voter approval to change the elections from “at-large” to “by-area.” Under the “by-area” election, only the registered voters of Area 1 will vote for candidates residing in Area 1. Only registered voters of Area 2 will vote for candidates residing in Area 2.

If a majority of the qualified electors voting on this measure vote for approval, the measure will become effective November 2014. A majority “no” vote on the measure will maintain the “at-large” elections for the District’s governing board.

s/DONNA R. ZIEGLER
County Counsel

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure K, which is printed in full in this sample ballot pamphlet. If you desire an additional copy of the measure, please call the Elections Official’s office at (510) 272-6933 and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you. You may also access the full text of the measure on the Alameda County website at the following address: www.acgov.org/rov/.
FULL TEXT OF MEASURE K

“For the election of governing board members of the Ohlone Community College District, shall members residing in each trustee area be elected by the registered voters in that trustee area?”

YES  NO
COUNTY COUNSEL’S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE L

ANALYSIS BY THE COUNTY COUNSEL OF A SAN LEANDRO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT SPECIAL PARCEL TAX MEASURE

Measure L, a San Leandro Unified School District (“District”) special parcel tax measure, seeks voter approval to authorize the District to levy an annual special parcel tax on each parcel of taxable real property for five years following adoption of the measure.

School districts have the authority to levy special taxes upon approval by two-thirds of the votes cast on special tax measures pursuant to Article XIIIA, Section 4 and Article XIIIC, Section 2 of the California Constitution and sections 50075-50077, 50079, and 53722 of the California Government Code.

If two-thirds of the qualified electors voting on this measure vote for approval, the District will impose a special tax on all parcels of taxable real property annually for five years. The tax rates will be as follows: $39.00 (thirty-nine dollars) per year per parcel for single family residential parcels, multi-family residential parcels with 2-4 units, and vacant/unimproved parcels; $19.00 (nineteen dollars) per unit for multi-family residential parcels with 5 or more units; and $0.02 (two cents) per square foot of lot size for commercial/industrial parcels. For purposes of this special parcel tax, “parcel” means any parcel of land that receives a separate tax bill for ad valorem property taxes from the Alameda County Treasurer-Tax Collector.

The Alameda County Treasurer-Tax Collector will collect the tax at the same time and in the same manner as ad valorem property taxes. Certain exemptions are available to any parcel owned and occupied by individuals 65 years of age or over or anyone receiving Supplemental Social Security Income for a disability. All property that is otherwise exempt from or upon which no ad valorem property taxes are levied in any year shall also be exempt from this tax.

If the measure passes, the funding revenue will be used for the specific purposes set forth in the full text of the measure printed in this sample ballot pamphlet, including: attracting and retaining teachers; maintaining classroom technology; etc. The measure further provides that the monies collected shall be accounted for separately and expended only for those specified purposes. The funds will not pay for administrative salaries. The measure provides for an independent citizens’ oversight committee and revenue and expenditure reports.

If two-thirds of the qualified electors voting on this measure do not vote for approval, the measure will fail, and the District will not be authorized to levy the special tax outlined above.

s/DONNA R. ZIEGLER
County Counsel

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure L, which is printed in full in this sample ballot pamphlet. If you desire an additional copy of the measure, please call the Elections Official’s office at (510) 272-6933 and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you. You may also access the full text of the measure on the Alameda County website at the following address: www.acgov.org/rov/.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE L
Save San Leandro schools from destructive State budget cuts! Vote YES on L to protect quality education for San Leandro students.

Over the past five years, Sacramento cut over $12 million from San Leandro schools causing devastating cuts to student academic programs. YES on L says enough is enough. Our students deserve better!

Every dime raised by Measure L goes to our local schools and CAN’T BE TAKEN AWAY BY SACRAMENTO.

YES on L protects and maintains small class sizes, art/music, library programs, physical education, security staff and teachers that are all essential for a good education.

- YES on L protects core academic math, science and reading programs.
- YES on L keeps school libraries open.
- YES on L retains high quality teachers.
- NO money can be used for administrators’ salaries.

YES on L prepares students for high demand jobs of the 21st century. By maintaining up-to-date computer and educational technology programs, YES on L allows students to compete in today’s high-speed, technologically advanced economy.

YES on L gets back to basics, ensuring our students get a solid educational foundation that prepares them for college.

YES on L maintains school security staff to keep crime away from our middle/high schools and provide students support and safety to stay in school and out of trouble.

Measure L requires strict fiscal accountability, including a five year sunset, annual financial audits, and independent citizens oversight to ensure funds are spent as promised. Seniors and those on disability can receive exemptions.

San Leandro public schools receive less funding and State support than ANY other School District in our region. YES on L gives our students the same opportunities as our neighbors.


s/Mary Styner
   Eden Area ROP Teacher of the Year
s/Ellen M. Corbett
   California State Senator
s/David Grodin
   Chair-Elect, San Leandro Chamber of Commerce
s/Phyllis Gee
   Senior Commissioner
s/Bob Maginnis
   San Leandro Police Chief, Retired

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE L
We must have open, honest, good faith discussions about our local government finances.

The San Leandro Unified School District is not telling you the whole truth about its finances and how Measure L attacks Proposition 13.

Yes, since 2006 the State cut $12,000,000.00 total from the San Leandro Unified School District budget, but what about the $160,000,000.00 in expensive bonds that San Leandro voters have already approved? They’re still $148,000,000.00 ahead at an average cost of over $350.00 per household, per year through 2035.

Isn’t $160,000,000.00 in approved local funding enough to offset $12,000,000.00 in cuts from Sacramento?

Now they’re attacking Proposition 13 in a very sneaky and deceptive way. Look at the Measure L ballot summary, what exactly does “rates on commercial/other types of parcels” mean?

Do some homework and review the full text of Measure L. Instead of one flat per parcel tax in the San Leandro Unified School District, there are five separate split roll property tax rates in Measure L.

Split roll assessments are dangerous first steps in dismantling the very strong protection of Proposition 13, which keeps our property taxes low and affordable for us all.

Measure L will hit struggling San Leandro businesses hard with new taxes ranging from $600.00 to well over $40,000.00 per year. This will result in higher prices and lost jobs in San Leandro.

Isn’t $160,000,000.00 in already approved local funding enough to offset $12,000,000.00 in cuts from Sacramento?

SAY NO TO SNEAKY AND DECEPTIVE TACTICS.
SAY NO TO HIGHER COSTS FOR LOCAL BUSINESSES.
SAY NO TO SPLIT ROLL ASSESSMENTS.
SAY NO TO ATTACKS ON PROPOSITION 13.
VOTE NO ON MEASURE L.

s/Thomas R. Silva
   CAAPAC Local Trustee
   San Leandro Business Property Owner
s/Marc Crawford
   CAAPAC Local Trustee
   San Leandro Business Property Owner

SLSML-2
ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE L

We are in very difficult economic times. Everyone has been badly hurt by the Great Recession. We must be very careful with the limited financial resources in our community.

Since 2006, San Leandro Voters have already approved $160,000,000.00 in expensive Bonds (Measure B and Measure M) for the San Leandro Unified School District at an average cost of over $350.00 per household per year through 2035.

Now the San Leandro Unified School District is attacking Proposition 13 by advocating a split roll assessment property tax scheme that will cause all business property in San Leandro to pay far more in property taxes than our neighboring communities. This will make it even more difficult for our struggling local businesses and will result in higher costs for all of us. Measure L will keep new businesses and jobs from locating in San Leandro.

Our public education costs are rising higher and higher, yet no one is talking about how we must get these costs under control. There are ineffective cost controls in Measure L. Until we put firm limits on the true costs of public education, our current problems will only get worse.

Measure L is only for five years. What happens afterwards? Do they ask us for more money in 2016 or what? We need long term solutions not hurried quick fixes that erode Proposition 13 and threaten our local businesses.

Take a good look at your ballot. There are three statewide and several other local tax measures to vote on in this election. How many new taxes can you afford, especially a tax that attacks struggling local businesses and erodes Proposition 13?

WE MUST SEND A LOUD AND CLEAR MESSAGE TO THE SAN LEANDRO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.

SAY NO TO OUT OF CONTROL COSTS.

SAY NO TO TEMPORARY QUICK FIX MEASURES.

SAY NO TO ATTACKS ON LOCAL BUSINESSES.

SAY NO TO ATTACKS ON PROPOSITION 13.

VOTE NO ON MEASURE L.

s/Thomas R. Silva
CAAPAC Local Trustee/San Leandro Business Property Owner

s/Marc Crawford
CAAPAC Local Trustee/San Leandro Business Property Owner

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE L

Don’t be misled by absentee landlords who don’t live in San Leandro and don’t want to pay their fair share! They don’t care that our schools have so little funding, teachers are literally rationing classroom supplies. It’s up to us to do something about this!

Vote YES on L to help San Leandro schools - the ONLY measure on your November ballot directly addressing San Leandro’s needs!

FACT: State budget cuts have slashed education funding. In just 5 years, Sacramento politicians cut $12 million from San Leandro schools. Your schools receive less funding than every other school district in our region.

FACT: All Measure L funds are legally required to be spent only on San Leandro schools and can’t be taken by Sacramento politicians.

FACT: Measure L upholds Proposition 13 and follows the law. Senior homeowners are exempt from paying under Measure L. Receiving your exemption is easy: visit www.sanleandro.k12.ca.us or call 510-667-3522 to apply.

FACT: San Leandro businesses SUPPORT Measure L! The San Leandro Chamber of Commerce endorses YES on L because it prepares students for jobs and careers in today’s tough economy.

YES on L protects quality education for San Leandro students by maintaining small class sizes, music, libraries, physical education, security staff and teachers – which are all essential for a good education.

Measure L includes tough taxpayer protections/guarantees:

• Citizens Oversight Committee
• Published annual financial audits
• Legally requires funds directly benefit student education
• Measure L CANNOT be used for administrator salaries/pensions.

Vote YES on L – give our students the opportunities our neighbors have.

s/Stephen Cassidy
Mayor, City of San Leandro

s/John J. Jermanis
San Leandro City Manager, Retired
Co-Chair, Yes on Measure L

s/David Grodin
Chair-Elect, San Leandro Chamber of Commerce

s/Deborah Cox
Chair, Citizens Bond Oversight Committee
Co-Chair, Yes on Measure L

s/Donna B. Reed
49 Year San Leandro Homeowner and Taxpayer
The District must act to protect quality education. The Measure would provide stable and predictable funding that our schools can count on to protect the most essential academic programs for students and retain quality teachers.

Money from the Measure would be used to protect and maintain small class sizes and the music, library, physical education, security staff and teachers that are all essential for a good education. Funds would also be used to ensure that our students get a solid educational foundation in academic subjects such as math, science, and reading, helping prepare them for entry into college and to compete in today’s tough job market. To compete in today’s high-speed, technologically advanced economy, it is critical to maintain up-to-date computer and educational technology programs for our students, and the Measure will help prepare students for high demand jobs of the twenty-first century.

The measure would also maintain the school security staff that keep crime away from our middle schools and high schools and provide students with the support and safety they need to stay in school and out of trouble.

With the Measure the academic quality of local schools will continue to improve, ensuring students have access to the teachers, small class sizes, computers and learning technology they need for academic and career success.

This measure would enhance local control of District schools, make our schools less dependent on Sacramento, and provide vital funding to support students and education at a time when they need it most.

By law, all funds from this local funding measure must be used to protect the specified programs in District schools and cannot be taken away by the State. Strict accountability is mandatory, including independent citizen oversight and annual audits to ensure funds are spent as promised. None of the funds will be used for administrator salaries.

Moneys raised under this Measure shall be authorized to be used only for the following purposes in accordance with priorities established by the Board and to the extent of available funds:

- Protect and maintain core academic math, science and reading programs
- Protect student safety
- Keep school libraries open
- Attract and retain high-quality teachers and staff including counselors
- Maintain classroom computers and instructional technology
- Protect and maintain physical education programs and athletic programs
- Protect and maintain art and music programs for a well-rounded education
- Protect and maintain small class sizes
- Minimize further budget cuts resulting from reductions in state funding for local schools

No parcel tax funds will be spent on administrative salaries.

A. Amount and Basis of Tax

1. Parcel of Taxable Real Property. The special tax shall be levied on every Parcel of Taxable Real Property within the District.

“Parcel of Taxable Real Property” is defined as any unit of real property within the District that receives a separate tax bill for ad valorem property taxes from the Alameda County Tax Collector (“County Tax Collector”). All property that is otherwise exempt from or upon which no ad valorem property taxes are levied in any year shall also be exempt from the special tax in such year.

Multiple parcels which are contiguous, under common ownership, contain a single-family residence, and that constitute one economic unit, meaning that they have the same primary purpose as the principal parcel and are not separate and distinct properties that may be independently developed or sold, shall comprise a single Parcel of Taxable Real Property for purposes of the parcel tax.

2. Uniform Application. The special tax shall be uniformly applied to each Parcel of Taxable Real Property within the following property classifications.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Property</th>
<th>Annual Amount of Tax per Parcel of Taxable Real Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>$39 per parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential With 2-4 Units</td>
<td>$39 per parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential With 5 or More Units</td>
<td>$19 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Industrial</td>
<td>$0.02 per square foot of lot size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant/Unimproved Parcels</td>
<td>$39 per parcel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For purposes of determining the rate of tax above, the following definitions shall apply:

- “Single Family Residential” includes parcels containing one or both of the following kinds of residential living units (a) those with no common walls on a single Assessor's parcel (i.e., single family detached homes); and (b) those with common walls each of which is assigned a unique Assessor's parcel number (i.e. condominiums and townhouses), each of which shall be treated as a Parcel of Taxable Real Property; and (c) mobile homes, each of which shall be treated as a Parcel of Taxable Real Property.

- “Multi-Family Residential” means a residential living unit with common walls on an Assessor’s parcel on which other units are located. Such parcels include, but are not limited to, duplexes, parcels with two (2) or more living units on a single assessor’s parcel; apartment buildings with at least two (2) units; and any and all other multi-family residential parcels.

- “Commercial/Industrial” means all improved Parcels of Taxable Real Property that do not meet the definition of Single Family Residential or Multi-Family Residential. Commercial/Industrial property includes, but is not limited to, retail buildings, shopping centers, hotels, motels, service stations, office buildings, hospitals, trailer parks, warehouses, transportation facilities, storage facilities, utilities, agricultural and farmland, light and heavy industrial and recreational land.

- “Vacant/Unimproved” means an unimproved parcel with no structures or buildings.

Every year, all Parcels of Taxable Real Property that were classified as Vacant parcels in the prior fiscal year, may be reclassified into another category if a building permit has been pulled as of January 1 of that year.

Any parcel that does not fall clearly within any category above shall be taxed $39 per parcel annually.

B. Exemptions for Seniors and People with Disabilities

Upon application, an exemption from payment of the special tax may be granted on any parcel owned by one or more persons 65 years of age or over who occupies said parcel as a principal residence (“Senior Citizen Exemption”) or on any parcel owned by one or more persons receiving Supplemental Security Income for a disability, regardless of age, who occupies said parcel as a principal residence (“SSI Exemption”).

C. Claims / Exemption Procedures

With respect to all general property tax matters within its jurisdiction, the County Tax Collector or other appropriate County tax official shall make all final determinations of tax exemption or relief for any reason, and that decision shall be final and binding. With respect to matters specific to the levy of the tax, including the Senior Citizen Exemption and the SSI Exemption and the appropriate tax classification, the decisions of the District shall be final and binding. The procedures described herein, and any additional procedures established by the Board shall be the exclusive claims procedure for claimants seeking an exemption, refund, reduction, or re-computation of the special tax by the District. Whether any particular claim is to be resolved by the District or by the County shall be determined by the District, in coordination with the County as necessary. Taxpayers wishing to challenge any determination of the County Tax Collector must do so under the procedures for correcting a misclassification of property pursuant to Part 9 of Division 1 of the California Revenue and Taxation Code or other applicable procedures. Taxpayers seeking a refund of any tax paid shall follow the procedures applicable to property tax refunds pursuant to the California Revenue and Taxation Code.

D. Appropriations Limit

Pursuant to California Constitution article XIIIB and applicable laws, the appropriations limit for the District will be adjusted periodically by the aggregate sum collected by levy of this special tax.

E. Mandatory Accountability Protections

1. Independent Citizens’ Oversight Committee. The Board shall provide for the creation of an independent citizens’ oversight committee to oversee the special taxes collected pursuant to the Measure to ensure that moneys raised under this Measure are spent only for the purposes described in this Measure. The Board shall provide by resolution for the composition, duties, funding, and other necessary information regarding the committee’s formation and operation.

2. Annual Reports. Upon the levy and collection of the education parcel tax, the Board shall cause an account to be established for deposit of the proceeds, pursuant to Government Code Section 50075.1. For so long as the tax is in effect, the Superintendent or the chief financial officer of the District shall cause a report to be filed with the Board no later than December 31 of each year, stating (1) the amount collected and expended in such year, and (2) the status of any projects or description of any programs funded. The report may relate to the calendar year, fiscal year, or other appropriate annual period, as said officer shall determine, and may be incorporated into or filed with the annual budget, audit, or other appropriate routine report to the Board.
3. **Specific Purposes.** All of the purposes named in the Measure shall constitute the specific purposes of the education parcel tax, and proceeds thereof shall be applied only for such purposes.

**F. Protection of Funding**

Current law forbids any decrease in State or federal funding to the District resulting from the adoption of a special tax. However, if any such funding is reduced or affected because of the adoption of this local funding measure, then the Board may reduce the amount of the special taxes levied as necessary in order to restore such State or federal funding and/or maximize the District’s fiscal position for the benefit of the educational program. As a result, whether directly or indirectly, no funding from this measure may be taken away by the State or federal governments.

**G. Severability**

The Board hereby declares, and the voters by approving this Measure concur, that every section and part of this Measure has independent value, and the Board and the voters would have adopted each provision hereof regardless of every other provision hereof. Upon approval of this Measure by the voters, should any part of the Measure or taxing formula be found by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid for any reason, all remaining parts of the Measure or taxing formula hereof shall remain in full force and effect to the fullest extent allowed by law.
CITY OF BERKELEY BOND MEASURE M

M

Shall the City of Berkeley issue general obligation bonds not exceeding $30,000,000 for street improvements and integrated Green Infrastructure such as rain gardens, swales, bioretention cells and permeable paving, to improve roads, reduce flooding and improve water quality in the creeks and Bay?

Financial Implications:
The average annual cost over the 30-year period the bonds are outstanding would be approximately $38, $81, and $116, respectively, for homes with assessed valuations of $330,500, $700,000 and $1,000,000.

CITY ATTORNEY’S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF BOND MEASURE M

This bond measure would authorize the issuance of $30 million of general obligation bonds. Bond proceeds would be used to construct street improvements, such as street repaving and rehabilitation, which would include flood control and water quality measures when appropriate and consistent with the Watershed Management Plan.

Street improvements would be prioritized based on the City’s 5 year street repaving plan, which is updated annually. Integrated flood control and water quality measures (“Green Infrastructure”) would include, but not be limited to, improvements such as: (a) surface level bio-retention measures (rain gardens, swales, bio-retention cells, permeable paving, etc.) within parking lanes, the planted areas of sidewalks, red zone curb-extensions, or street medians; and (b) large underground storage pipes, which would fill during storm events and then discharge metered flows into the existing storm drain pipelines. Under the Watershed Management Plan, the purposes of Green Infrastructure are to reduce flooding and to improve water quality in the City’s creeks and Bay.

Financial Implications

The year after the first bonds are issued, the tax rate required to meet the estimated debt service would be $14.47 per $100,000 of assessed valuation. This rate is expected to decrease each year (assuming one bond series) with the average $10.84 per $100,000 of assessed valuation during the 30-year issue.

The average annual cost over the 30-year period the bonds are outstanding would be approximately $38, $81, and $116, respectively, for homes with assessed valuations of $330,500, $700,000 and $1,000,000.

The estimated annual tax for a home with an assessed valuation of $330,500 would be $47.82 the first year after bonds are issued and average $35.82 over the 30-year life of the bonds.

s/ZACH COWAN
Berkeley City Attorney

TAX RATE STATEMENT FOR BOND MEASURE M

City of Berkeley Streets and Watershed Bond Measure M

An election will be held in the City of Berkeley (the “City”) on November 6, 2012, on the question of issuing bonds in the principal amount of $30,000,000 to finance improvements to streets, with integrated watershed improvements, as described in the bond measure. If the bonds are approved, the City expects to sell the bonds in a single series of bonds. Principal and interest on the bonds will be paid from taxes levied on taxable property in the City. The following tax rate information is given to comply with Sections 9400-9404 of the Elections Code of the State of California.

Based on estimated assessed valuations available at the time of filing of this statement:

1. The best estimate of the tax rate that would be required to be levied to fund the bond issue during the first fiscal year after the sale of the first series of bonds, based on estimated assessed valuations available at the time of filing of this statement, is $0.01588 per $100 ($15.88 per $100,000) of assessed valuation in fiscal year 2013/14.

2. The best estimate of the tax rate that would be required to be levied to fund the bond issue during the first fiscal year after the last sale of the bonds, based on estimated assessed valuations available at the time of filing of this statement, is $0.01588 per $100 ($15.88 per $100,000) of assessed valuation in fiscal year 2013/14.

3. The best estimate of the highest tax rate that would be required to be levied to fund the bond issue, based on estimated assessed valuations available at the time of filing this statement, is $0.01588 per $100 ($15.88 per $100,000) of assessed valuation in fiscal year 2013/14.

4. The best estimate of the average annual tax rate which would be required to be levied to fund the bond issue over the entire life of the bond debt service, based on estimated assessed valuations available at the time of filing of this statement, is $0.01165 per $100 ($11.65 per $100,000) of assessed valuation. The final fiscal year in which a tax is anticipated to be collected is 2042/43.

Voters should note that the estimated tax rates are based on the assessed value of taxable property on the County’s official tax rolls, not on the property’s market value. In addition, taxpayers eligible for a property tax exemption, such as the homeowner’s exemption, will be taxed at a lower effective tax rate than described above. Certain taxpayers may also be eligible to postpone payment of taxes. Property owners should consult their own property tax bills and the County Assessor to determine their property’s assessed value and any applicable tax exemptions.

The actual tax rates and the years in which they will apply may vary from those presently estimated, due to variations from these estimates in the timing of bond sales, the amount of bonds sold and market interest rates at the
time of each sale, and actual assessed valuations over the term of repayment of the bonds. The estimates are based upon the City’s projections and are not binding upon the City. The dates of sale and the amount of bonds sold at any given time will be determined by the City based on the need for construction funds and other factors. The actual interest rates at which the bonds will be sold will depend on the bond market at the time of each sale. Actual future assessed valuation will depend upon the amount and value of taxable property within the City as determined by the County Assessor in the annual assessment and the equalization process.

Dated: July 19, 2012

s/Christine Daniel
City Manager, City of Berkeley

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF BOND MEASURE M
VOTE YES ON MEASURE M

It is a fact: our city streets are failing faster than we can repair them. If they are not repaired at a sustainable level now, the price tag for keeping them functional will escalate dramatically. Based on the City Auditor’s 2011 report, fixing a street before it fails costs from $36,000 to $306,000 per mile. Reconstructing a street after it fails costs $1.15 million per mile. 12% of our streets are currently “failed.” If we do not act now our “failed” streets will escalate to 21% in 5 years.

Our city budget for street repair in 2014 is only $3.6 million dollars. The current projection to keep all of our streets in good repair is $46 million. The longer we wait, the more expensive it will become. At the end of five years the price tag escalates to roughly $71 million.

At a cost of only $30 per year for an average property, this bond measure will contribute $30 million for our streets and allow us to make related improvements for watershed health and flood control.

Measure M is a wise investment in our town.

Without Measure M, the condition of our streets will continue to worsen and the City will be unable to fix them. When we refurbish a street, we will include watershed improvements such as permeable paving and bio-swales to reduce flooding and filter runoff. Measure M can also provide matching funds for grants for more extensive watershed health improvements: a win-win for the City of Berkeley. Let us take care of, and improve, our city’s infrastructure now.

Make a wise investment in our city streets, provide matching funds for grants, create opportunity for watershed improvements.

Vote YES on Measure M.

s/Loni Hancock
State Senator
s/Linda Maio
Vice Mayor
s/Weldon Rucker
Former City Manager
s/Margo Schueler
Public Works Commissioner
s/Sherry Smith
President, League of Women Voters of Berkeley, Albany & Emeryville
REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF BOND MEASURE M

MOST VOTERS WOULD PROBABLY PLACE STREET REHABILITATION AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT AS TOP PRIORITY. SO WHAT’S THE PROBLEM WITH MEASURE M?

MEASURE M IS A PIECEMEAL APPROACH GRUDGINGLY SPONSORED BY A DIVIDED COUNCIL.

- Three Councilmembers didn’t vote to support this bond.
- In the voter poll, substantial support was expressed for a comprehensive $50 Million street bond. Yet Council reduced this to accommodate the low priority pool measures.
- Councilmembers disagreed on how much, if anything, should be spent on streets versus trophy projects, like bioswales. Can we now trust them to properly spend the bond money?
- Measure M won’t meet our street and water management needs, doesn’t guarantee wise spending, and specifically enables spending on expensive unproven technology.

THE FIVE YEAR STREET RE-PAVING PLAN THAT WOULD GUIDE MEASURE M EXPENDITURES IS OUT OF DATE AND NOT EXPLICITLY ALIGNED WITH THE LATEST AND BEST PRACTICES RECOMMENDED BY THE CITY AUDITOR.

- According to the City website, the most current street plan commenced in 2010 and terminates in 2015. There is no indication that it has been modified or updated to incorporate newest Best Management Practices.
- Our City Auditor advised that, for a cost-effective program, the streets chosen for remedial action must be those indicated under the state-of-the-art StreetSaver program. StreetSaver is not mentioned at all in the City’s Five Year Plan or in Measure M as the guiding mechanism for street rehabilitation.

WE CAN DO BETTER! WE NEED A COMPREHENSIVE, CLEAR, PROFESSIONAL PLAN FOR OUR STREETS AND SEWERS.

s/Shannon R. Brown
Director, Berkeley Budget SOS

s/Barbara Gilbert
Treasurer, Committee for FACTS

s/Isabelle Gaston
President, Northeast Berkeley Association (NEBA)

s/Karl J. Reeh
President, Le Conte Neighborhood Association

s/Ted Edlin
President, Council of Neighborhood Associations (CNA); Former Chair, Housing Advisory Commission; Former Commissioner, Fire Safety Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST BOND MEASURE M

Measure M does not guarantee appropriate rehabilitation of our streets or the cessation of flooding. Further, it enables funding of experimental technologies that may add to the cost of fixing our streets and sewers.

After many years of under-funding and neglect, Berkeley’s streets are in terrible condition. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission ranks Berkeley streets near bottom (81st) among 98 cities. This is one problem area that has been extensively studied and for which clear cost estimates and solutions are available. Our City Auditor has made specific scientifically-based recommendations: to bring our streets into very good condition and reduce the unfunded streets liability to ZERO will take $85 Million over five years and $7.5 Million annual maintenance thereafter.

This is not what’s proposed in Measure M. Measure M doesn’t insure that the streets chosen for remedial action are those indicated under Best Management Practices and the state-of-the-art StreetSaver program. If the wrong streets are chosen, the overall cost will go up. Fixing streets BEFORE they fail costs far less than reconstructing failed streets ($36 Thousand to $309 Thousand per mile versus $1.15 Million per mile).

Berkeley has not had prudent fiscal governance. Our employee costs have ballooned and are eating up moneys for vital needs. We have over $500 Million in unfunded infrastructure need and ZERO dollars set aside to meet it. According to a recent voter survey, streets/sewers are top priority. We need the FACTS and a community-based consensus plan BEFORE Council presents ill-conceived tax measures to the voters. Measure M IS NOT a true start toward solving our street and sewer problem.

We can do better. Join us in voting NO on Measure M.

Berkeley Budget SOS
Committee for FACTS
LeConte Neighborhood Association
Northeast Berkeley Association (NEBA)

s/Shannon R. Brown
Director, Berkeley Budget SOS

s/Barbara Gilbert
Treasurer, Committee for FACTS

s/Karl J. Reeh
President, Le Conte Neighborhood Association

s/Isabelle Gaston
President, Northeast Berkeley Association (NEBA)

s/Ted Edlin
President, Council of Neighborhood Associations (CNA); Former Chair, Housing Advisory Commission; Former Commissioner, Fire Safety Commission
REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST
BOND MEASURE M

Measure M is solely about making street repairs and related watershed improvements NOW. We must not wait.

Measure M’s $30 million bond offers the only effective way to begin repairing streets NOW. Every year we wait adds $6 million in costs, and increases the risk of accidents and lawsuits against the City.

Measure M is part of a planned approach, consistent with Berkeley’s Street Repair Plan, Watershed Management Plan, and the City Auditor’s recommendations. In addition to funding street repair, Measure M will raise matching funds for flood control grants and storm water management. Grant possibilities for such projects have been identified.

Berkeley is 134 years old and it has infrastructure needs. Measure M addresses infrastructure needs and cannot be used for any other purposes, including unfunded pension liabilities, as the opponents incorrectly claim. Street repairs are a separate issue.

Opponents of Measure M want to hold street repair hostage to passage of their “FACTS” initiative. Don’t let the opponents disdain for sensible city government sway you as a voter. We need to move forward with a prudent, achievable plan to stop flooding in West Berkeley, repair our streets, and improve the environment while keeping our streets safe for cars, bicycles, and pedestrians.

Vote YES on Measure M.

s/Ann-Marie Hogan
    City Auditor
s/Andy Katz
    Director, East Bay Municipal Utility District
s/Margo Schueler
    Public Works Commissioner
s/Tom Bates
    Mayor, City of Berkeley
s/Sherry Smith
    President, League of Women Voters of Berkeley, Albany & Emeryville
AUTHORIZING THE CITY OF BERKELEY TO INCUR BONDED DEBT AND ISSUE A GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND FOR STREET AND RELATED WATERSHED IMPROVEMENTS

WHEREAS, this resolution is adopted pursuant to and in conformance with Chapter 7.64 of the Berkeley Municipal Code; and

WHEREAS, the City has developed a 5 year street repaving plan, which it updates annually; and

WHEREAS, the City has developed a Watershed Management Plan to manage and improve overall watershed health within the City’s boundaries by identifying and prioritizing infrastructure needs associated with aging facilities and capacity needs, and in particular utilizing Green Infrastructure elements (such as rain gardens, swales, bio-retention cells, permeable paving) within the public right-of-way and streets; and

WHEREAS, because the City’s streets, with their curbs and gutters, are an integral part of the City’s storm water management system, storm water management improvements consistent with the Watershed Management Plan should be integrated into street improvements where they will enhance water quality and flood control; and

WHEREAS, existing annual funds and funding sources are insufficient to adequately improve the City’s streets, aged storm drains and storm water management systems and improve water quality in the City’s creeks and the Bay; and

WHEREAS, the City needs to repair its failing streets by significantly accelerating implementation of its 5 year street repaving plan, but existing funds and funding sources are inadequate to do so; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has therefore determined that the public interest requires additional funding for acceleration of the 5 year street repaving plan, as it is updated annually.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the People of the City of Berkeley that:

A. Proceeds of bonded indebtedness shall be used to construct the following facilities (“Improvements”):

   1. Street repaving and rehabilitation consistent with the 5 year street repaving plan as it is updated annually, and sufficient to significantly accelerate the implementation of that plan.

   2. Installation of Green Infrastructure (GI), as it is defined in the Watershed Management Plan as part of the street work described in the preceding paragraph, when appropriate. GI includes, but is not limited to: (a) surface level bio-retention measures (rain gardens, swales, bio-retention cells, permeable paving, etc.) within the parking strip, planter area of sidewalks, red zone curb-extensions, and in street medians as feasible; and (b) large underground storage pipes, which would fill during storm events and then discharge metered flows into the existing storm drain pipelines.

For purposes of this measure, “Improvements” shall also include design, permitting, administrative and overhead costs.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the People of the City of Berkeley that:

A. The estimated cost of the Improvements to be funded by any bonds issued pursuant to this measure is $30 million, although the total cost of all Improvements needed to address all of the City’s street-related capital needs is in excess of that amount.

B. The amount of the principal of the general obligation indebtedness (the “Bonds”) to be incurred shall not exceed $30 million.

C. The estimated cost may include legal and other fees and the cost of printing the Bonds and other costs and expenses incidental to or connected with the issuance and sale of the Bonds.

D. The proceeds of the Bonds authorized to be issued by this resolution shall be used to finance construction of the Improvements and to pay any fees and costs in connection with the issuance of the Bonds, including but not limited to, legal fees and bond printing costs.

E. The maximum rate of interest to be paid on the Bonds shall not exceed eight percent (8%).
Shall the City of Berkeley issue general obligation bonds not exceeding $19,400,000 to fund construction of replacement Warm and Willard pools, and renovation or replacement of associated facilities, as well as repair, renovation or replacement of locker rooms and associated facilities at the existing West Campus and King pools?

Financial Implications:
The average annual cost over the 30-year period the bonds are outstanding would be approximately $7.01 per $100,000 of assessed valuation.

This bond measure would authorize the issuance of $19.4 million of general obligation bonds, but only if a companion measure to pay for operation and maintenance of those pools is also approved by the voters at the November 6, 2012 election.

Bond proceeds would be used to implement the City’s Pools Master Plan by funding the following improvements:

**Warm Water Pool.** Bond funds would be used to construct a replacement indoor warm pool and repair, renovate or replace associated facilities, including but not limited to utility structures, including locker rooms, restrooms, mechanical rooms and equipment, and related site improvements such as paving, lighting, fencing, utilities, and landscaping and other amenities, at West Campus (University Avenue at Bonar Street). Bond funds would also be used to renovate or replace the existing locker room serving the existing outdoor lap pool at West Campus.

**Willard Middle School.** Bonds funds would be used to replace the previously existing swimming pool at Willard Middle School, and to repair, renovate or replace associated facilities, including but not limited to utility structures, including locker rooms, restrooms, mechanical rooms and equipment, and related site improvements such as paving, lighting, fencing, utilities, and landscaping and other amenities.

**King Middle School.** Bonds funds would also be used to repair, renovate or replace the locker rooms at the swimming pool at King Middle School and, to the extent funds are available, for related site improvements such as paving, lighting, fencing, utilities, and landscaping and other amenities.

Financial Implications
The year after the first bonds are issued, the tax rate required to meet the estimated debt service would be $9.55 per $100,000 of assessed valuation. This rate is expected to decrease each year (assuming one bond series) with the average $7.01 per $100,000 of assessed valuation during the 30-year issue.

The estimated annual tax for a home with an assessed valuation of $330,500 would be $31.56 the first year after bonds are issued and average $23.17 over the 30-year life of the bonds.

s/ZACH COWAN
Berkeley City Attorney
TAX RATE STATEMENT FOR BOND MEASURE N

An election will be held in the City of Berkeley (the “City”) on November 6, 2012, on the question of issuing bonds in the principal amount of $19,400,000 to finance improvements to the West Campus warm water pool, Willard Middle School pool and King Middle School pool as described in the bond measure. If the bonds are approved, the City expects to sell the bonds in a single series of bonds. Principal and interest on the bonds will be paid from taxes levied on taxable property in the City. The following tax rate information is given to comply with Sections 9400-9404 of the Elections Code of the State of California.

Based on estimated assessed valuations available at the time of filing of this statement:

1. The best estimate of the tax rate that would be required to be levied to fund the bond issue during the first fiscal year after the sale of the first series of bonds, based on estimated assessed valuations available at the time of filing of this statement, is $0.00955 per $100 ($9.55 per $100,000) of assessed valuation in fiscal year 2013/14.

2. The best estimate of the tax rate that would be required to be levied to fund the bond issue during the first fiscal year after the last sale of the bonds, based on estimated assessed valuations available at the time of filing of this statement, is $0.00955 per $100 ($9.55 per $100,000) of assessed valuation in fiscal year 2013/14.

3. The best estimate of the highest tax rate that would be required to be levied to fund the bond issue, based on estimated assessed valuations available at the time of filing this statement, is $0.00955 per $100 ($9.55 per $100,000) of assessed valuation in fiscal year 2013/14.

4. The best estimate of the average annual tax rate which would be required to be levied to fund the bond issue over the entire life of the bond debt service, based on estimated assessed valuations available at the time of filing of this statement, is $0.00701 per $100 ($7.01 per $100,000) of assessed valuation. The final fiscal year in which a tax is anticipated to be collected is 2042/43.

Voters should note that the estimated tax rates are based on the assessed value of taxable property on the County’s official tax rolls, not on the property’s market value. In addition, taxpayers eligible for a property tax exemption, such as the homeowner’s exemption, will be taxed at a lower effective tax rate than described above. Certain taxpayers may also be eligible to postpone payment of taxes. Property owners should consult their own property tax bills and the County Assessor to determine their property’s assessed value and any applicable tax exemptions.

The actual tax rates and the years in which they will apply may vary from those presently estimated, due to variations from these estimates in the timing of bond sales, the amount of bonds sold and market interest rates at the time of each sale, and actual assessed valuations over the term of repayment of the bonds. The estimates are based upon the City’s projections and are not binding upon the City. The dates of sale and the amount of bonds sold at any given time will be determined by the City based on the need for construction funds and other factors. The actual interest rates at which the bonds will be sold will depend on the bond market at the time of each sale. Actual future assessed valuation will depend upon the amount and value of taxable property within the City as determined by the County Assessor in the annual assessment and the equalization process.

Dated: July 3, 2012

s/Christine Daniel
City Manager, City of Berkeley
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF BOND MEASURE N

Berkeley’s municipal swimming pools are a treasure. Countless children, families and individuals rely on them for exercise, recreation and swim instruction. However, Berkeley has 50% fewer public pools than it did two years ago.

In 2010, Berkeley voters came close to approving Measure C, which would have funded the renovation of the King, West Campus and Willard pools and rebuilt the Warm Water Pool. After Measure C lost, the city closed two of the four public pools due to a shortage of operating funding. After 40 years of providing recreation to children in South Berkeley, Willard Pool is instead filled with dirt. The Warm Water Pool has also been demolished, disenfranchising the children, elderly and disabled who need a multi-use warm pool for therapy and swim instruction. The locker rooms at King and West Campus also need major renovation and repair.

Children, the disabled and elderly, and all Berkeleyans deserve modern, energy-efficient pools. For the health, sustainability and recreation of Berkeley residents, we need Measure N. Measure N would provide needed funds to renovate and reopen Willard Pool and build a new Warm Water Pool. It would also make needed improvements to the King and West Campus pools.

While some say we shouldn’t approve bonds until the City fixes its budget situation, we shouldn’t punish our children, the disabled and elderly. We can fix our pools and plan for our city’s financial health at the same time. This is our last chance to repair and keep open all of our pools.

Measure N was put on the ballot by a unanimous City Council. Please join community leaders; the Presidents of major neighborhood associations; and elderly and disability advocates in supporting Measure N. Let’s restore the Willard and Warm Pools for the health and wellbeing of future generations.

s/Loni Hancock
State Senator
s/Tom Bates
Mayor of Berkeley
s/John T. Selawsky
President, Berkeley School Board
s/Ed Gold
Chair, Berkeley’s Commission on Aging
s/Jim Bullock
President, Bateman Neighborhood Association

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF BOND MEASURE N

OUR OFFICIALS SHED CROCODILE TEARS FOR POOLS

- Pools advocates claim: two of four pools were closed and new dedicated funding is required due to a shortage of operating funding…ongoing budget cuts; Willard Pool is “filled with dirt”; the Warm Pool has been demolished; locker rooms need major renovation.
- They don’t tell you why there is limited funding—our budget has been eaten up by ballooning employee costs, misplaced priorities, and lack of long-term planning.
- They don’t tell you that the City itself deliberately filled Willard Pool with dirt.
- They don’t tell you that BUSD tore down a fine warm water pool in a historic building for which a $3.25 Million rehabilitation bond was approved by the voters in 2000 but never used.

OUR OFFICIALS DISTORT THE FACTS

- They claim that the public only has two pools available.
- They ignore that there are nine pools open to the public plus two more in Albany and one at Berkeley High that could be opened. The Pool Master Plan stated there is no deficit in pools even while inexplicably excluding the three YMCA pools.

THERE ARE COST-EFFECTIVE SOLUTIONS IF VOTERS WANT THEM

- Albany built two large pools for only $8 Million.
- For a small fraction of the proposed $20M and with a cooperative approach, the City could meet any unmet pool needs by working with Cal, Albany, BUSD, and the YMCA to extend hours and seasons of operation and selectively raise pool temperatures.

s/Shannon R. Brown
   Director, Berkeley Budget SOS
s/Barbara Gilbert
   Treasurer, Committee for FACTS
s/Beverly Doane
   Treasurer, Claremont-Elmwood Neighborhood Assn.
s/Isabelle Gaston
   President, Northeast Berkeley Association (NEBA)

s/Ted Edlin
   President, Council of Neighborhood Associations (CNA)
ARGUMENT AGAINST BOND MEASURE N

We strongly urge you to vote NO on ALL Berkeley tax measures until we have the fiscal FACTS and a comprehensive community consensus plan to address the City’s looming insolvency.

Berkeley has $1.2 Billion in unfunded liabilities, half for employee costs and half for infrastructure needs. Infrastructure needs include $28 Million for parks, $87 Million for streets, $118 Million for public facility seismic retrofit, and $207.5 Million for watershed.

Who will determine which are most important—you, the public, or our insular City Council responding to their own priorities and relentless lobbying from special interest groups?

A $19.4 Million bond for pools and a $604 Thousand inflation-indexed annual operations tax are NOT aligned with voter priorities. Voters rejected a similar measure in an expensive special election two years ago. Further, in a recent voter survey, the use of scarce tax resources for pools ranked second to bottom among eleven possible funding areas.

Why would our City need more money for operation and maintenance when it annually funds $200 Thousand for employee health club membership, a $240 Thousand inflation-indexed guaranteed annual retirement for our former City Manager, and many other no-cost-to-employee benefits?

Yes, pools and swim skills are very important. But Berkeley already has nine pools open to the public (two City/BUSD, four Cal, and three YMCA), another pool at Berkeley High, and two pools available nearby in Albany. These pools have excellent well-priced swim programs.

Choices need to be made about how to spend our scarce tax dollars. These choices must reflect community priorities and be part of a consensus plan. Do you really think $20 Million for more pools is top priority?

Vote NO on Measures N and O

Berkeley Budget SOS
Committee for FACTS
Claremont-Elmwood Neighborhood Association (CENA)
Northeast Berkeley Association (NEBA)

s/Shannon R. Brown
  Director, Berkeley Budget SOS
s/Barbara Gilbert
  Treasurer, Committee for FACTS
s/Beverly Doane
  Treasurer, Claremont-Elmwood Neighborhood Assn. (CENA)

s/Isabelle Gaston
  President, Northeast Berkeley Association (NEBA)

s/Ted Edlin
  President, Council of Neighborhood Associations (CNA); Former Chair, Housing Advisory Commission; Former Commissioner, Fire Safety Commission

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST BOND MEASURE N

Vote YES on N. Invest in the health and well-being of our City.

Berkeley has major disparities in health, based on race and income. Critical to the health and success of our youth is access to opportunities for exercise and recreation. Unfortunately, Berkeley has half as many public pools as it did two years ago.

We need Measure N to rebuild the Willard and Warm Water Pools and restore all of our pools.

Opponents of Measure N have presented a “sky is falling” picture of the city’s fiscal health, but these arguments are false.

Berkeley’s fiscal health is sound. We have a better bond rating (AA+) than most sovereign governments, and our debt payments make up only 2% of annual revenues. We are not verging on bankruptcy, and are in strong financial shape.

Opponents argue that the City shouldn’t undertake any major project until it has cash to cover all unfunded liabilities, but this is just as untrue as saying a homeowner shouldn’t repair his roof without having all the money in the bank to pay off his mortgage. To let our pools crumble and disappear is pennywise and pound-foolish.

Opponents have also wildly exaggerated the availability of other pools in Berkeley.

We need Measure N to ensure that all people throughout our city have access to pools for exercise, therapy, and recreation.

Don’t give in to the misinformation. Vote YES on N. Invest in our pools for future generations and improve the health, value and success of our city.

s/Gordon Wozniak
  Berkeley City Councilmember
s/Shahryar Abbasi
  ASUC External Affairs Vice President
s/C. Mark Humbert
  President, Neighborhood Association; Claremont-Elmwood resident

s/Lisa Stephens
  Chair, Berkeley Rent Stabilization Board; former Chair, Parks & Recreation Commission

s/Thomas F. Killilea
  Schools & Parent leader
FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURE N
RESOLUTION NO. 65,804–N.S.
AUTHORIZING THE CITY OF BERKELEY TO INCUR
BONDED DEBT AND ISSUE A GENERAL OBLIGATION
BOND FOR POOLS AND ASSOCIATED FACILITIES

WHEREAS, this resolution is adopted pursuant to and in
conformance with Chapter 7.64 of the Berkeley Municipal
Code; and
WHEREAS, on November 17, 2009, the Berkeley City
Council adopted the Pools Master Plan; and
WHEREAS, the City Council has determined to implement
the following elements of the Pools Master Plan (the
“Improvements”) at this time:

• Warm Water Pool. Construct a replacement
indoor warm pool and repair, renovate or replace
associated facilities, including but not limited to
utility structures, including locker rooms (including
the locker room serving the existing outdoor
lap pool), restrooms, mechanical rooms and
equipment, and related site improvements such as
paving, lighting, fencing, utilities, and landscaping
and other amenities, at West Campus (University
Avenue at Bonar Street).

• Willard Middle School. Renovate or replace
the previously existing swimming pool and repair,
renovate or replace associated facilities, including
but not limited to utility structures, including
locker rooms, restrooms, mechanical rooms and
equipment, and related site improvements such as
paving, lighting, fencing, utilities, and landscaping
and other amenities, at Willard Middle School.

• King Middle School. Repair, renovate or replace
the locker rooms at the swimming pool at King
Middle School and related site improvements
such as paving, lighting, fencing, utilities, and landscaping
and other amenities, as funding allows; and

WHEREAS, the Improvements are estimated to cost
$19,400,000; and

WHEREAS, funds are not available to construct the
Improvements unless the City issues a general obligation
bond; and

WHEREAS, implementation of the Pools Master Plan,
even in part, will serve the public interest of the residents
of Berkeley by providing both recreational and therapeutic
pools, thereby providing opportunities for improved health
and fitness of Berkeley residents; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has therefore determined
that the public interest requires additional funding for
construction of the Improvements.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the People of the City
of Berkeley that the public interest requires
the issuance of a general obligation bond in the amount of
$19,400,000 to fund construction of the Improvements as
described above.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the People of the City of Berkeley that:

A. The estimated cost of the Improvements to be
funded by any bonds issued pursuant to this measure is
$19.4 million.

B. The amount of the principal of the general obligation
indebtedness (the “Bonds”) to be incurred shall not exceed
$19.4 million.

C. The estimated cost may include legal and other
fees and the cost of printing the Bonds and other costs and
expenses incidental to or connected with the issuance and
sale of the Bonds.

D. The proceeds of the Bonds authorized to be issued
by this resolution shall be used to finance construction
of the Improvements and to pay any fees and costs in
connection with the issuance of the Bonds, including but
not limited to, legal fees and bond printing costs.

E. The maximum rate of interest to be paid on the
Bonds shall not exceed eight percent (8%).

BE IT FURTHER AND FINALLY RESOLVED by
the People of the City of Berkeley that in the event this
measure is approved by two thirds of the voters, it shall
take effect, and debt may be incurred, only if all of the
following conditions are met:

A. the voters also approve the special tax on
the November 6, 2012, ballot to fund operation and
maintenance of the new Warm Water and Willard pools;

B. after the City of Berkeley executes a lease or leases
with the Berkeley Unified School District for all of the pool
sites on which funds will be spent, and such lease or leases
provide: (1) for a term of at least 40 years with at least
one ten-year option that may be exercised by the City; (2)
for nominal rent; and (3) that the Berkeley Unified School
District shall pay user fees on the same basis as other users.
CITY OF BERKELEY MEASURE O

Shall a special tax of $0.00779 per square foot of improvements on land in Berkeley be authorized to fund maintenance and operation of the replacement Warm Water and Willard Pools, if a bond measure funding construction of those pools is adopted?

Financial Implications

The annual cost in fiscal year 2013-14 would be $14.80 for a 1,900 square foot home, $23.37 for a 3,000 square foot home and $77.90 for a 10,000 square foot building.

CITY ATTORNEY’S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE O

The proposed measure would impose a special tax totaling approximately $604,000 per year to fund operation and maintenance of two proposed public swimming pools: a warm water pool to be constructed at the Berkeley Unified School District’s West Campus on University Avenue and a pool at Willard School to replace the previously existing pool there.

For purposes of this tax, “operation and maintenance” would include recreation program services consisting of the administration and operation of the City’s aquatics program, and maintenance and repair of the pools and their associated facilities, which include but are not limited to locker rooms, utility buildings, pumps, filters and piping.

This measure would take effect only if a bond measure on the November 6, 2012, ballot is approved to construct both pools and make improvements to associated facilities such as locker rooms, utility buildings, pumps, filters and piping.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE O

Vote YES on O. Restore Willard Pool and the Warm Water Pool. Support our community pools for the health, recreation and well-being of our children, the elderly and disabled, and all Berkeleyans.

Our municipal pools are an important community resource. They provide recreation activities for our children and youth and improve the health of our community.

Measure N will provide the capital funds to renovate Willard Pool and build a new Warm Water Pool through a bond measure. Since bond funding can’t be used for operating pools, Measure O tax revenues will go this purpose. This measure would provide aquatics programs to serve the youth of South Berkeley as well as provide recreation and therapy to children, seniors, and people with mobility impairments.

Due to ongoing budget cuts, and the current recession, the City can only operate the King and West Campus pools due to limited funding. Keeping open the new Willard and Warm pools requires new dedicated funding for their operation and maintenance.

Measure O would fund adequate hours and programs to enable all Berkeley children and residents to swim safely. It would also provide resources to maintain our pools, and modernize and make them more energy-efficient.

This tax would only be assessed if Measure N (also on the November ballot) passes. Measure O is a modest tax which would make sure that our entire city benefits from our neighborhood pools and is also an investment in the health and improvement of our entire city.

Measure O was put on the ballot by a unanimous City Council. Please join elected leaders, neighborhood association presidents, and senior and disability advocates in supporting this important measure. Keep all of our pools open for future generations.

s/Loni Hancock
State Senator
s/Tom Bates
Mayor of Berkeley
s/John T. Selawsky
President, Berkeley School Board
s/Edward Gold
Chair, Berkeley’s Commission on Aging
s/George Beier
Neighborhood Association President, Willard resident

s/ZACH COWAN
Berkeley City Attorney
REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE O

OUR OFFICIALS SHED CROCODILE TEARS FOR POOLS

• Pools advocates claim: two of four pools were closed and new dedicated funding is required due to a shortage of operating funding...ongoing budget cuts; Willard Pool is “filled with dirt”; the Warm Pool has been demolished; locker rooms need major renovation.
• They don’t tell you why there is limited funding—our budget has been eaten up by ballooning employee costs, misplaced priorities, and lack of long-term planning.
• They don’t tell you that the City itself deliberately filled Willard Pool with dirt.
• They don’t tell you that BUSD tore down a fine warm water pool in a historic building for which a $3.25 Million rehabilitation bond was approved by the voters in 2000 but never used.

OUR OFFICIALS DISTORT THE FACTS

• They claim that the public only has two pools available.
• They ignore that there are nine pools open to the public plus two more in Albany and one at Berkeley High that could be opened. The Pool Master Plan stated there is no deficit in pools even while inexplicably excluding the three YMCA pools.

THERE ARE COST-EFFECTIVE SOLUTIONS IF VOTERS WANT THEM

• Albany built two large pools for only $8 Million.
• For a small fraction of the proposed $20M and with a cooperative approach, the City could meet any unmet pool needs by working with Cal, Albany, BUSD, and the YMCA to extend hours and seasons of operation and selectively raise pool temperatures.

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE O

We strongly urge you to vote NO on ALL Berkeley tax measures until we have the fiscal FACTS and a comprehensive community consensus plan to address the City’s looming insolvency.

Berkeley has $1.2 Billion in unfunded liabilities, half for employee costs and half for infrastructure needs. Infrastructure needs include $28 Million for parks, $87 Million for streets, $118 Million for public facility seismic retrofit, and $207.5 Million for watershed.

Who will determine which are most important—you, the public, or our insular City Council responding to their own priorities and relentless lobbying from special interest groups?

A $19.4 Million bond for pools and a $604 Thousand inflation-indexed annual operations tax are NOT aligned with voter priorities. Voters rejected a similar measure in an expensive special election two years ago. Further, in a recent voter survey, the use of scarce tax resources for pools ranked second to bottom among eleven possible funding areas.

Why would our City need more money for operation and maintenance when it annually funds $200 Thousand for employee health club membership, a $240 Thousand inflation-indexed guaranteed annual retirement for our former City Manager, and many other no-cost-to-employee benefits?

Yes, pools and swim skills are very important. But Berkeley already has nine pools open to the public (two City/BUSD, four Cal, and three YMCA), another pool at Berkeley High, and two pools available nearby in Albany. These pools have excellent well-priced swim programs. Choices need to be made about how to spend our scarce tax dollars. These choices must reflect community priorities and be part of a consensus plan. Do you really think $20 Million for more pools is top priority?

Vote NO on Measures N and O

Berkeley Budget SOS
Committee for FACTS
Claremont-Elmwood Neighborhood Assn. (CENA)
Northeast Berkeley Association (NEBA)

s/Shannon R. Brown
    Director, Berkeley Budget SOS
s/Barbara Gilbert
    Treasurer, Committee for FACTS
s/Beverly Doane
    Treasurer, Claremont-Elmwood Neighborhood Assn.
s/Isabelle Gaston
    President, Northeast Berkeley Association (NEBA)

s/Ted Edlin
    President, Council of Neighborhood Associations, (CNA)
REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST
MEASURE O

Our public pools are not only an important community resource, but are also critical to the health and success of children and all Berkeley residents. Unfortunately, Berkeley has half as many public pools as it did two years ago.

Measure N provides needed capital funding to restore the mothballed 50-year-old Willard Pool and the demolished Warm Pool, while Measure O ensures dedicated funding for their modernization, operation and maintenance. This modest tax would only be assessed if Measure N passes.

Opponents of Measure O have presented a “sky is falling” picture of the city’s fiscal health, but these arguments are false.

Berkeley’s fiscal health is sound. We have a better bond rating (AA+) than most sovereign governments, and our debt payments make up only 2% of annual revenues. We are not verging on bankruptcy, and are in strong financial shape.

Opponents argue that the City shouldn’t undertake any major project until it has cash to cover all unfunded liabilities, but this is just as untrue as saying a homeowner shouldn’t repair his roof without having all the money in the bank to pay off his mortgage.

We need Measure O so that all people throughout our city have access to pools for exercise, therapy, and recreation. Don’t give in to the misinformation. Vote YES on O. Invest in our pools to improve the health, value and success of our city.

s/Jesse Arreguin
Berkeley City Councilmember

s/Shahryar Abbasi
ASUC External Affairs Vice President

s/C. Mark Humbert
President, neighborhood association; Claremont-Elmwood Resident

s/Nancy Carleton
Co-Chair, neighborhood association in South Berkeley; Former Chair, Zoning Board; Former Vice Chair, Parks & Recreation Commission

s/Thomas F. Killilea
Schools & Parent leader
FULL TEXT OF MEASURE O
ORDINANCE NO.                  -N.S.
AUTHORIZING SPECIAL TAX TO FUND OPERATION
AND MAINTENANCE OF THE REPLACEMENT
WARM WATER AND WILLARD POOLS
BE IT ORDAINED by the by the people of the City of
Berkeley as follows:

Section 1. Findings and purpose.
A. On November 17, 2009, the Berkeley City Council
adopted the Pools Master Plan, and on June 26, 2012,
proposed a general obligation bond to fund replacement
of the Warm Water Pool and Willard Pool.
B. It is necessary to have an assured source of funds for
maintenance and operation of those pools or they would be
at risk of closure or reduction in hours and programs in the
future.
C. Construction of these replacement pools will serve
the public interest of the residents of Berkeley by providing
both recreational and therapeutic pools, thereby providing
opportunities for improved health and fitness of Berkeley
residents.

Section 2. Special tax.
A. The tax imposed under this Chapter is solely for
the purpose of raising revenue to pay for operation and
maintenance of the replacement Warm Water Willard
Pools. “Operation and maintenance” includes recreation
program services consisting of the administration and
operation of the City’s aquatics program, and maintenance
and repair of the pools and their associated facilities,
which include but are not limited to locker rooms, utility
buildings, pumps, filters and piping.
B. Section 4 of Article XIIIA of the California
Constitution (Proposition 13) allows two-thirds of the
qualified electors of the City to impose a special tax within
the City, provided the special tax is not an ad valorem
imposed by this Chapter collected by the county of
Alameda for purposes of assessing and collecting real
tax, but is rather a property tax as defined in Section 1
of Article XIIIA of the California Constitution.

Section 3. Tax authorized--Tax rate--Indexing.
A. There is imposed a special tax of $0.00779 per
square foot on all improvements in the City, for the purpose
set forth in Section 2.A above.
B. The tax imposed by this Chapter shall be operative
on July 1, 2013, subject to Section 12.
C. The City Council of Berkeley is authorized to
increase the tax rate authorized by this Chapter annually
in May by up to the greater of the cost of living in the
immediate San Francisco Bay Area, per capita personal
income growth in the state (each as verified by official
United States Bureau of Labor statistics), or 5%. If either
index referred to above is discontinued, the City shall use
any successor index specified by the applicable agency,
or if there is none, the most similar existing index then in
existence.

Section 4. Definitions.
For purposes of this Chapter, the following terms shall be
defined as set forth below:
A. “Building” means any structure having a roof
supported by columns or by walls and designed for the
shelter or housing of any person, chattel or property of any
kind. The word “building” includes the word “structure.”
B. “Improvements” means all buildings or structures
erected or affixed to the land.
C. “Parcel” means a unit of real estate in one ownership
as shown on the most current official assessment role of
the Alameda County Assessor.
D. “Square footage” means the total gross horizontal
areas of all floors, including usable basement and cellars,
below the roof and within the outer surface of the main
walls of buildings (or the center lines of party walls
separating such buildings or portions thereof) or within
lines drawn parallel to and two feet within the roof line
of any building or portion thereof without walls (which
includes, notwithstanding subsection 3 of this definition,
the square footage of all porches), and including pedestrian
access walkways or corridors, but excluding the following:
1. Areas used for off-street parking spaces or loading
berths and driveways and maneuvering aisles relating
thereto.
2. Areas which are outdoor or semi-outdoor areas
included as part of the building to provide a pleasant
and healthful environment for the occupants thereof
and the neighborhood in which the building is located.
This exempted area is limited to stoops, balconies and
to natural ground areas, terraces, pools and patios which
are landscaped and developed for active or passive recreational
use, and which are accessible for use by occupants of the
building.
3. Arcades, porticoes, and similar open areas which
are located at or near street level, which are accessible
to the general public, and which are not designed or used as
sales, display, storage, service or production areas.
E. “Structure” means anything constructed or erected,
the use of which requires location on the ground or
attachment to something having location on the ground.

Section 5. Authority of the City Manager.
It shall be the duty of the City Manager’s staff to collect
and receive all taxes imposed by this Chapter, and to keep
an accurate record thereof. The City Manager is charged
with the enforcement of this Chapter, except as otherwise
provided herein, and may prescribe, adopt and enforce
rules and regulations relating to the administration and
enforcement of this Chapter, including provisions for the
re-examination and correction of returns and payments.
The City Manager may prescribe the extent to which any
ruling or regulation shall be applied without retroactive
effect.

Section 6. Interest and penalties.
A. The City Council is authorized to have the taxes
imposed by this Chapter collected by the county of
Alameda in conjunction with the county’s collection of property tax revenues for the City. In the event that the county of Alameda collects the taxes imposed by this Chapter, the imposition of penalties, additional fees and interest upon persons who fail to remit any tax imposed by this Chapter, or who fail to remit any delinquent remittance under this Chapter, shall be subject to and governed by the rules, regulations and procedures utilized by the county in its collection of property taxes for the City, and in its collection of this additional tax for the City.

B. Every penalty imposed and such interest as accrues under the provisions of this Chapter shall become a part of the tax herein required to be paid.

Section 7. Refunds.
Whenever the amount of any tax, penalty or interest has been paid more than once or has been erroneously or illegally collected or received by the City under this Chapter, it may be refunded as provided in Chapter 7.20 of the Berkeley Municipal Code.

Section 8. Collection.
The amount of any tax, penalty, and interest imposed under the provisions of this Chapter shall be deemed a debt to the City. Any person owing money under the provisions of this Chapter shall be liable to an action brought in the name of the City for the recovery of such amount.

Section 9. Severability clause.
The provisions of this Chapter shall not apply to any person, association, corporation or to any property as to whom or which it is beyond the power of the City Council to impose the tax herein provided. If any sentence, clause, section or part of this Chapter, or any tax against any individual or any of the several groups specified herein is found to be unconstitutional, illegal or invalid, such unconstitutionality, illegality, or invalidity shall affect only such clause, sentence, section or part of this Chapter and shall not affect or impair any of the remaining provisions, sentences, clauses, sections or other parts of this Chapter.
It is declared to be the intention of the City Council of the City of Berkeley that this Chapter would have been adopted had such unconstitutional, illegal or invalid sentence, clause, section or part thereof not been included herein.

Section 10. Violation--Penalty.
Failure to perform any duty or obligation imposed by this Chapter is a misdemeanor punishable as set forth in Chapter 1.20 of this code, but may be charged, in the discretion of the citing officer, as an infraction.

Section 11. Increase appropriations limit.
Pursuant to California Constitution Article XIIIB, the appropriation limit for the City is increased by the aggregate sum authorized to be levied by this special tax for each of the four fiscal years from 2013-14 through 2016-17.

Section 12. Effectiveness.
A. This Chapter shall take effect only if the voters also approve the general obligation bond measure on the November 6, 2012, ballot to construct a new Warm Water Pool and a new Willard Pool and make improvements to their associated facilities, and to renovate the locker rooms at King Pool, and that measure becomes effective.

B. No tax may be collected under this Chapter for any period during which the City does not have a lease for the facilities upon which tax proceeds would be spent, which conforms to the conditions set forth in the general obligation bond measure on the November 6, 2012, ballot.
CITY ATTORNEY’S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE P

This measure would authorize the City to continue to spend the proceeds of the Parks Maintenance Tax, Library Relief Tax, Emergency Medical Services Tax, the Emergency Services for Severely Disabled Persons Tax, and the Fire Protection and Emergency Response and Preparedness Tax, all of which were previously approved by the voters. Under Article XIIIB of the California Constitution a city is limited to appropriating (i.e. authorizing expenditure of) the amount of taxes (adjusted by inflation) that it spent in the 1986-1987 fiscal year. This limit may only be exceeded if the voters approve the excess expenditures by a majority vote. This constitutional restriction on appropriations (expenditures) is in addition to the constitutional requirement that special taxes must be approved by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the people. Although the appropriations (expenditure) limit was raised by the voters to allow continued expenditure of the proceeds of these taxes when the taxes were approved, voter authorization to raise the spending limit must be renewed every four years. A city has two years to obtain voter approval on this expenditure. After that, the tax increase would have to be returned to the taxpayers within two years. Submitting the measures individually would cost $26,000 per measure and could confuse voters since the net effect of the measures is to raise the City’s expenditure limit by the amount of taxes previously approved by the voters. For this reason, a single measure would raise the City’s expenditure limit by the aggregate amount of the taxes raised by prior voter-approved tax measures.

Financial Implications:
The measure would not increase taxes nor adopt a new tax. It would authorize the City to continue to spend tax funds previously approved by the voters for the purposes specified in those voter-approved tax measure for fiscal years 2013 through 2016.

s/ZACH COWAN
Berkeley City Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE P

Because of a state mandated ceiling on city expenditures, this ballot measure comes before the voters every four years for approval. It must pass or city services will be sharply curtailed.

This measure does not raise taxes.
During the past decade, the city’s population has grown by more than nine percent. We are providing essential services for our expanding population with a smaller city staff. Our citizens want a wide variety of city services and have voted by a two-thirds margin to fund those services during the past two decades. Those tax measures included funding for City libraries (1988), parks (1997) Emergency Medical Services (1997), Emergency Services for Severely Disabled Persons (1998), and for keeping fire stations open and improving emergency medical response and disaster preparedness (2008).

This measure will allow City of Berkeley Departments to continue to provide these important, tax supported community services to our growing population.

If the measure does not pass, the City will lose tens of millions of dollars in voter approved tax revenue, forcing dramatic reductions in landscaping, park maintenance, library services, paramedic and physically disabled services, fire safety, and disaster preparedness. These services impact the quality of life throughout our city.

This measure was passed unanimously by the City Council.

We urge your AYE vote.

s/Loni Hancock
State Senator
s/Winston Burton
Chair Berkeley Board of Library Trustees
s/Ronald D. Adler
Medical Doctor
s/Jan Garrett
Disability Rights Activist
s/John Steere
Environmental Planner

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE P WAS SUBMITTED
FULL TEXT OF MEASURE P

Shall the appropriation limit under Article XIIIB of the California Constitution (which is a ceiling on city expenditures) be increased to allow for the expenditure of taxes previously approved by the voters for parks maintenance; libraries; emergency medical services; emergency services for severely disabled persons; and fire protection and emergency response and preparedness, for fiscal years 2013 through 2016?

Financial Implications: This measure would not increase taxes. It only authorizes expenditure of existing voter-approved taxes.
Without increasing the rate, shall an ordinance be adopted to update Berkeley’s existing utility users tax, which funds police, fire and other essential City services, to keep current with changes in technology and Federal and State laws while maintaining exemptions for nonprofit educational organizations and hospitals, adding an exemption for low-income taxpayers, and requiring an annual verification and public report as to collection and expenditure of the tax?

CITY ATTORNEY’S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE Q

This measure is proposed by the Berkeley City Council to update the City’s existing Utility Users Tax (“UUT”) to be consistent with current practice. This measure will not increase the current tax.

The UUT is levied on utility users in the City. The City has imposed the UUT on telephone services since 1984. The proceeds of the UUT can only be spent on City services and cannot be taken away by the State. UUT revenues are paid into the City’s general fund to pay for such services as police and fire protection, public health services and recreational programs, maintenance of City infrastructure such as streets and parks, and senior programs.

The City’s UUT, like those of most California cities, referred to federal law to describe telephone services. These definitions have changed and telephone technology has changed significantly. The measure would update the UUT to modernize its language and to treat all technologies equally so every phone customer is treated fairly, whether they use the latest technology or older phone services. It would ratify Council ordinances that updated the tax.

This measure would also add a requirement for an annual verification of tax collection and a public report of the tax expenditures related to the amendment.

We ask for an Aye vote

s/Tom Bates
Mayor
s/Susan Wengraf
Berkeley City Councilmember
s/Darryl Moore
Berkeley City Councilmember District 2
s/Charles L. Robinson
Home Owner
s/Maxwell G. Anderson
Berkeley City Councilmember

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE Q

At the City Council meeting on June 12, 2012 the Council voted unanimously to place the Utility Users Tax measure on the November 2012 ballot. This measure asks voters to 1) update the existing measure and 2) extend a new federal exemption to Berkeley’s low income taxpayers.

The amendments are primarily technical and do not change the existing tax rate.

Recent changes in federal law and changes in communications technology mean the City’s utility users tax on telecommunications services needs to be updated. In addition, federal law providing exemptions for nonprofit educational organizations and hospitals was recently broadened to include a new exemption for low income taxpayers that should be extended to Berkeley citizens. If this measure does not pass, low income taxpayers will not receive the new federal exemption.

This tax funds important public services: police and fire protection, public health services, recreational programs, maintenance of our streets and parks, library services, and senior programs. These programs provide the strong community connections that make the City of Berkeley unique in the Bay Area.

The proposed measure requires an annual verification of tax collection and a public report of the tax expenditures related to the amendment.

We ask for an Aye vote

s/Tom Bates
Mayor
s/Susan Wengraf
Berkeley City Councilmember
s/Darryl Moore
Berkeley City Councilmember District 2
s/Charles L. Robinson
Home Owner
s/Maxwell G. Anderson
Berkeley City Councilmember

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE Q WAS SUBMITTED

s/ZACH COWAN
Berkeley City Attorney
any telephonic type and quality of communication including that which is interconnected to the public switched network, which allows people to talk to each other without the necessity of conversing in person. In determining whether a service constitutes a telephone communication service, all technology used to transmit voice communications from one person to another shall be included irrespective of whether, for example, such technology utilizes computer processing applications on the form, code or protocol of the content or where the origination and/or termination points of the transmission, conveyance or routing are not fixed. Such means of transmission shall include, without limitation for the purpose of transmitting messages or information (including but not limited to voice, telegraph, teletypewriter, data facsimile, video, or text) by electronic, radio or similar means whether such transmission occurs by wire, cable, fiber-optic, light wave, laser, microwave, radio wave including, but not limited to, cellular service, personal communications service (PCS), specialized mobile radio (SMR), and other types of personal wireless service regardless of radio spectrum used, switching facilities, satellite or any other similar facilities, and include the transmission, conveyance, or routing of voice, data, audio, video, or any other information or signals to a point, or between or among points, whether or not such information is transmitted through interconnected service with the public switched network, whatever the technology used, whether such transmission, conveyance or routing occurs by wire, cable, fiber-optic, light wave, laser, microwave, radio wave including, but not limited to, cellular service, personal communications service (PCS), specialized mobile radio (SMR), and other types of personal wireless service regardless of radio spectrum used, switching facilities, satellite or any other similar facilities. "The term ‘telephone communication services’ includes such transmission, conveyance, or routing in which computer processing applications are used to act on the form, code or protocol of the content for purposes of transmission, conveyance or routing without regard to whether such services are referred to as voice over internet protocol (VoIP) services or are classified by the Federal Communications Commission as enhanced or value added, and includes video and/or data services that are functionally integrated with telecommunications services. ‘Telephone communication services’ include, but are not limited to, the following services regardless of the manner or basis on which such services are calculated or billed: central office and custom calling features (including but not limited to call waiting, call forwarding, caller identification and three-way calling), local number portability, text messaging, ancillary telecommunications services, prepaid and post-paid telecommunications services (including but not limited to prepaid calling cards); mobile telecommunications service; private telecommunication service; paging service; 800 service (or any other toll-free numbers designated by the Federal Communications Commission); and value-added non-voice data service. For purposes of this section, ‘private telecommunication service’ means any dedicated telephone communications service that entitle a user to exclusive or priority use of communications channels. “Telephone communication service” does not include: internet access services to the extent they are exempt from taxation under the Internet Tax Freedom Act, 47 U.S.C. 151 note; video programming services; and digital downloads, such as downloads of books, music, ringtones, games and similar digital products."

**Section 2. Code Amendment.**

That a new subdivision (S) is hereby added to Section 7.70.020 of the Berkeley Municipal Code, to read as follows:

S. “Ancillary telecommunications services” shall mean services that are associated with or incidental to the provision, use or enjoyment of telecommunications services including, but not limited to, the following:

1. Services that link two or more participants of an audio or video conference call, including the provision of a telephone number.
2. Services that separately state information pertaining to individual calls on a customer's billing statement.
3. Services that provide telephone number information, and/or address information.
4. Services offered in connection with one or more telecommunications services, which offer advanced calling features that allow customers to identify callers and to manage multiple calls and call connections.
5. Services that enable customers to store, send or receive recorded messages.

**Section 3. Code Amendment.**

That Section 7.70.050 of the Berkeley Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

7.70.050 Telephone users tax

A. There is hereby imposed a tax upon every person who uses any international, interstate and/or intrastate telephone communication services in the City, other than a telephone corporation. Interstate calls shall include calls to and from the District of Columbia or any U.S. territory.
The tax imposed by this section shall be at the rate of seven and one-half percent (7.5%) of the charges made for such telephone communication services. The tax shall be collected from the service user by the telephone communication services supplier or its billing agent. To the extent allowed by federal and state law, the tax on telephone communication services is intended to, and does, apply to all charges within the city’s tax jurisdiction, such as charges billed to a telephone account having a situs in the city as permitted by the Mobile Telecommunications Sourcing Act of 2000, 4 U.S.C. Section 116 et seq. There is a rebuttable presumption that telephone communication services billed to a billing or service address in the city are used, in whole or in part, within the city’s boundaries, and that such services are subject to taxation under this Chapter. There is also a rebuttable presumption that telephone communication services sold within the city that are not billed to a billing address or provided to a primary physical location are used, in whole or in part, within the city’s boundaries and that such services are subject to taxation under this chapter. shall apply to a service user if the billing or service address of the service user is within the City’s boundaries, irrespective of whether a particular telephone communication service originates and/or terminates within the City. If the billing address of the service user is different from the service address, the service address of the service user shall be used.

B. The following shall be exempt from the tax imposed by this Section, if any:

1. Service paid for by inserting coins in coin-operated telephones with respect to local telephone service, or with respect to toll telephone service if the charge for such toll telephone service is less than 25 cents; except that where such coin-operated telephone service is furnished for a guaranteed amount, the amounts paid under such guarantee plus any fixed monthly or other periodic charge shall be subject to the tax.

2. Payment received from any person for services used in the collection of news for the public press, or a news ticker service furnishing a general news service similar to that of the public press, or radio broadcasting, or in the dissemination of news through the public press, or a news ticker service furnishing a general news service similar to that of the public press, or by means of radio broadcasting, if the charge for such service is billed in writing to such person.

3. Payment received for services furnished to an international organization designated under the International Organizations Immunities Act and defined in 22 USCA § 288, or to the American National Red Cross.

4. Payment received for any toll telephone service which originates within a combat zone from a member of the Armed Forces of the United States performing service in such combat zone, as determined under such section, provided a certificate, setting forth such facts as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe, is furnished to the person receiving such payment.

5. The amount paid for any toll telephone service to the extent that the amount so paid is for use by a common carrier, telephone or telegraph company, or radio broadcasting station or network in the conduct of its business as such.

6. The amount paid by a nonprofit hospital for services furnished to such organization. For purposes of this subsection, the term "nonprofit hospital" means a hospital which is exempt from federal and state income tax under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

7. Any payment received for services or facilities furnished to the government of any State, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia.

8. Any amount paid by a nonprofit educational organization for services or facilities furnished to such organization. For purposes of this subsection, the term "nonprofit educational organization" means an educational organization which is exempt from income tax under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code. The term also includes a school operated as an activity of an organization which is exempt from income tax under section 501(a) if such school normally maintains a regular faculty and curriculum and normally has a regularly enrolled body of pupils or students in attendance at the place where its educational activities are regularly carried on.

9. Private mobile radio service. For purposes of this chapter "private mobile radio service" is a radio communication service which is not a commercial mobile service. A "mobile service" means a radio communication service carried on between mobile stations or receivers and land stations, and by mobile stations communicating among themselves, and includes (A) both one-way and two-way radio communication services, (B) a mobile service which provides a regularly interacting group of base, mobile, portable, and associated control and relay stations (whether licensed on an individual, cooperative, or multiple basis) for private one-way or two-way land mobile radio communications by eligible users over designated areas of operation, and (C) any service for which a license is required in a personal communications service established pursuant to the proceeding entitled "Amendment to the Commission's Rules to Establish New Personal Communications Services" (GEN Docket No. 90-314; ET Docket No. 92-100), or any successor proceeding. A "commercial mobile service" is a "mobile service" that is provided for profit and makes interconnected service available (A) to the public or (B) to such classes of eligible users as to be effectively available to a substantial portion of the public.

C. The tax administrator may, from time to time, issue and disseminate to telecommunication service suppliers, which are subject to the tax collection requirements of this chapter, administrative rulings identifying those telecommunication services that are subject to the tax of subsection (A) above. The administrative rulings shall implement the intent of the City Council that the telephone users tax be imposed on any person who initiates or receives high-quality voice communications without regard to the type or kind of transmission media or technology that exists on the date the amendments to this section became effective or which may be developed in the future. Such administrative rulings shall be consistent with legal nexus and laws.
pertaining to telephone communications services and shall not impose a new tax, revise an existing tax methodology, or increase an existing tax, except as allowed by California Government Code §§ 53750(h)(2) and (h)(3) or other law. The tax administrator may consider state-wide interpretive rules and guidelines promulgated by any government agency or association of government agencies as a factor in determining the intent of voters adopting this section. To the extent that the tax administrator determines that the tax imposed under this section shall not be collected in full for any period of time, such an administrative ruling falls within the tax administrator’s discretion to settle disputes. The tax administrator’s exercise of prosecutorial forbearance under this chapter does not constitute a change in taxing methodology for purposes of Government Code § 53750(h), and the city does not waive or abrogate its ability to impose the telephone users’ tax in full as a result of issuing such administrative rulings and may suspend such rulings and recommence collection of the tax without additional voter approval. The administrative ruling shall be consistent with and shall not impose a new tax or increase an existing tax without voter approval.

D. As used in this section, the term "charges" shall include the value of any other services, credits, property of every kind or nature, or other consideration provided by the service user in exchange for the telephone communication services. If a non-taxable service and a taxable service are billed together under a single charge, the entire charge shall be deemed taxable unless the service supplier identifies, by verifiable data, non-taxable charges based upon its books and records that are kept in the regular course of business, which shall be consistent with generally accepted accounting principles. The service supplier has the burden of proving the proper apportionment of taxable and non-taxable charges.

E. As used in this section, the term "charges" shall not include charges for any type of service or equipment furnished by a service supplier subject to public utility regulation during any period in which the same or similar services or equipment are also available for sale or lease from persons other than a service supplier subject to public utility regulation.

F. To prevent actual multi-jurisdictional taxation of telephone communication services subject to tax under this section, any service user, upon proof to the tax administrator that the service user has previously paid the same tax in another American state or city on such telephone communication services, shall be allowed a credit against the tax imposed to the extent of the amount of such tax legally imposed in such other state or city; provided, however, the amount of credit shall not exceed the tax owed to the City under this section. For purposes of establishing sufficient legal nexus for the imposition and collection of utility users’ tax on charges for telephone communication services pursuant to this chapter, "minimum contacts" shall be construed broadly in favor of the imposition and collection of the utility users’ tax to the fullest extent permitted by California and federal law, and as it may change from time to time.

G. The tax on telephone communication services imposed by this section shall be collected from the service user by the service supplier. The amount of tax collected in one (1) month shall be remitted to the tax administrator on or before the last day of the following month; and must be received by the tax administrator on or before the last day of the following month.

H. For purposes of imposing a tax or establishing a duty to collect and remit a tax under this Section, "substantial nexus" and "minimum contacts" shall be construed broadly in favor of the imposition, collection and/or remittance of the utility users tax to the fullest extent permitted by state and federal law, and as that law may change from time to time. Any telephone communication service (including VoIP) used by a person with a service address in the city, which service is capable of terminating a call to another person on the general telephone network, shall be subject to a rebuttable presumption that "substantial nexus/minimum contacts" exists for purposes of imposing a tax, or establishing a duty to collect and remit a tax, under this chapter. A service supplier shall be deemed to have sufficient activity in the city to be obligated to collect and remit the tax imposed by this chapter if it does any of the following: maintains or has within the city, directly or through an agent or subsidiary, a place of business of any nature; solicits business in the city by employees, independent contractors, resellers, agents or other representatives; solicits business in the city by means of advertising that is broadcast or relayed from a transmitter within the city or distributed from a location within the city; or advertises in newspapers or other periodicals printed and published within the city or through materials distributed in the city by means other than the United States mail.

I. The tax imposed by this Section shall not apply to any person whose total personal income, from all sources, for the previous calendar year, does not exceed that level which shall constitute "very low-income," as may be established by resolution of the City Council. Any taxpayer claiming the exemption under this Section shall be required to demonstrate his or her entitlement thereto annually by submitting a claim for a refund, with supporting documentation, to the Finance Director in the manner and at the time established in regulations and/or guidelines hereafter promulgated by the City Manager. Such applications shall be on forms provided by the Finance Director, or his or her designee, and shall provide and/or be accompanied by such information as the Finance Director shall require, including but not limited to, federal income tax returns and W-2 forms. Upon timely receipt and verification of the required claim and supporting documentation, the Finance Director shall promptly refund the tax paid for the prior 12 months. Any person or entity claiming an exemption from the tax imposed by this Chapter shall file a verified statement of exemption on a form prescribed by the City Manager prior to June 30th of the first fiscal year for which the exemption is sought.

Section 4. Code Amendment.

That a new Section 7.70.055 is hereby added to the Berkeley Municipal Code to read as follows:
7.70.055 Exclusion of Internet Access from Telephone Tax

Nothing in section 7.70.050 (Telephone users tax) is intended to include charges for Internet Access within the scope of taxable charges for telephone communications services.

Section 5. Code Amendment.

That Section 7.70.180 of the Berkeley Municipal Code is hereby added to read as follows:

7.70.180 Effect of state and federal authorization

To the extent that the City’s authorization to impose or collect any tax imposed under this chapter is expanded or limited as a result of changes in state or federal law, no amendment or modification of this Chapter shall be required to conform the tax to those changes, and the tax shall be imposed and collected to the full extent of the City’s authorization up to the full amount of the tax imposed under this Chapter.

Section 6. Code Amendment.

That Section 7.70.190 of the Berkeley Municipal Code is hereby added to read as follows:

7.70.190 Verification Audit

The City shall annually verify that the taxes owed under section 7.70.050 have been properly applied, exempted, collected, and remitted in accordance with this Chapter, and properly expended according to applicable law, and issue a public report of the findings of such verification. The annual verification shall be performed by a qualified auditor and shall employ reasonable, cost-effective steps to assure compliance, including the use of sampling audits. The audit of a service supplier shall not be required where the cost of the audit is expected to exceed the additional tax revenue to be derived from the performance of the audit.

Section 7. Amendment of Ordinance.

Chapter 7.70 of the Berkeley Municipal Code as amended by this Ordinance may be repealed or amended by the City Council without a vote of the people except as follows: as required by Proposition 218, any amendment to that Chapter that increases the amount or rate of tax beyond the levels authorized by this Ordinance may not take effect unless approved by a vote of the people. The City Council may impose the taxes authorized by that Chapter in any amount or rate which does not exceed the rate approved by the voters of the City.

Section 8. Ratification.

Ordinance Nos. 6,926-N.S. and 6580-N.S., are hereby ratified.

Section 9. Severability.

If any section, sentence, clause, phrase, or portion of this Ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid or unenforceable by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining sections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or portions of this ordinance shall nonetheless remain in full force and effect. The people of the City of Berkeley hereby declare that they would have adopted each section, sentence, clause, phrase, or portion of this Ordinance, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or portions of this Ordinance be declared invalid or unenforceable and, to that end, the provisions of this Ordinance are severable.

Section 10. Majority Approval; Effective Date; Execution.

This Ordinance shall be effective only if approved by a majority of the voters voting thereon and shall go into effect ten (10) days after the vote is declared by the City Council. The Mayor and City Clerk are hereby authorized to execute this Ordinance to give evidence of its adoption by the voters.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE R

Twenty six years ago, Berkeley voters changed the way City Councilmembers are elected by implementing district elections. The problem we face now is that when the District Elections Charter Amendment was approved, it put in place boundaries that could only be changed to a limited degree, regardless of population changes. Over the decades, population changed but the boundaries didn’t, so that the system became increasingly outdated and unfair.

By federal law the Berkeley City Council is required to adopt new Council district boundaries following each decennial census to reflect changes in population and ensure the principle of “one person, one vote,” so a simple and equitable system is needed.

Measure R keeps in place our system of district elections but provides common sense changes to Berkeley’s redistricting process to replace the outdated rules put in place decades ago. Under the Measure, redistricting will base City Council district lines on 1) geographic boundaries and major streets so that lines are clear and easy to follow; 2) respect for communities of interest (such as neighborhoods), topography, geography, cohesiveness, contiguity, integrity, and compactness of territory; and 3) will keep in place the policy that Councilmembers cannot be redistricted out of office.

This measure simplifies the City Charter by removing geographic restrictions of district boundaries, makes redistricting easier, and setting clear and fair rules to make sure that district boundaries follow state law and consider communities of interest.

Measure R is a good-government measure, which creates a fair and inclusive process, at no significant cost to the City. Please join a unanimous City Council and good government groups in supporting Measure R.

S/ Sherry Smith  
President, League of Women Voters of Berkeley, Albany & Emeryville
S/ Nancy Skinner  
Assemblymember
S/ Aryn del Lamb-Marsh  
President, Berkeley Common Cause
S/ Connor Landgraf  
ASUC President
S/ Tom Bates  
Mayor, City of Berkeley

s/ZACH COWAN  
Berkeley City Attorney
REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE R

Welcome to Texas.

The 1986 District Elections Charter Amendment specified the borders of Berkeley’s eight council districts. Measure R erases all those instructions and allows current council-members to draw district lines at their discretion and for their personal benefit without the consent of voters!

The district borders were specified in the original amendment to prevent just the kind of gerrymandering Measure R would institutionalize. Under Measure R, the only restrictions on the council are perfectly vague: “integrity”, “topography”, “community interest”, “major arteries”, and those are only required to be “taken into consideration.”

No council should be given this much power! While adjustments are currently required ten years based on census counts, the council is obliged to adhere as closely as feasible to the Charter boundaries, while upholding Federal equal population requirements.

If our Council just wanted to adjust those boundaries to better reflect changing populations, they would specify new boundaries in this Charter Amendment instead of giving themselves alone the power to draw them, and make themselves councilmembers for life. Any massive change to the boundaries must go before the voters, according to the current law! Measure R is an end run around this key provision.

Measure R is NOT good government. It is NOT fair and inclusive. It gives all the power to sitting Councilmembers and takes it away from the people of Berkeley. The Council only needs this much power in order to abuse it. Don’t give it to them!

Join us in voting NO on Measure R.

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE R

Twenty-six years ago Berkeley residents voted to abolish at large council seats. The people of Berkeley changed the city charter and enacted district elections. This occurred because I, along with many others, felt residents were not being heard or properly represented by our council members. I looked for a solution along with others to alleviate the problem; We decided the solution was to elect our council members by “Districts”. I, and my team drew the district lines by talking to various people in the community and drawing from my experience as a lifelong Berkeley resident. From the time I entered elementary school until I completed my degree at the University of California, Berkeley, I’ve seen the power of the Berkeley electorate. I worked for the City of Berkeley and the Berkeley Unified School District; I attended St. Paul African Methodist Episcopal Church South Berkeley. I keenly understand how powerful the Berkeley community is when we work together. Empowered by this knowledge, we were able to know where to place the district lines allowing for true representation for all Berkeley constituents. The final product of both the district map and charter was presented to the public to vote on. Now the City Council is threatening to override the will of the electorate, proposing changes that will allow them to modify District lines anyway they want with or without our input.

Don’t let them take our choices away.

s/Pamela Y. Sanford
Author of: “Districts A New Beginning 1986”

s/Jacquelyn McCormick
Founder Berkeley Council Watch, Berkeley Budget SOS Coordinator

s/Beverly Doane
Treasurer Claremont Elmwood Neighborhood Assn
REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST
MEASURE R

Berkeley’s population is growing, changing, and shifting. **Districts that were fair and representative 26 years ago are decades outdated.** We must fix this problem.

Districts must be as equal in population as possible. The City is required by federal law to complete redistricting every 10 years, and it is crucial that this process is fair and equitable. This change does not allow the Council to “modify district lines anyway they want” as the opposition claims: **Measure R clearly states that the city will be divided into districts that respect geographic boundaries, neighborhoods, and other communities as defined by California law.**

As always, there will continue to be a public process where people can submit their own maps to Council, comment on other maps submitted, and have a voice in the redistricting process.

Adoption of Ballot Measure R is a common sense response to federally-mandated redistricting. **Measure R is supported by good-government organizations, the entire Berkeley City Council, and university students.** It is a fair and inclusive process with no significant costs to the City.

**Please join a unanimous City Council, good-government groups, and Cal students in supporting Measure R.**

s/Sherry Smith  
President, League of Women Voters of Berkeley, Albany and Emeryville

s/Aryndel Lamb-Marsh  
President, Berkeley Common Cause

s/Shahryar Abbasi  
ASUC External Affairs Vice President

s/Darryl Moore  
Berkeley City Councilmember

s/Tom Bates  
Mayor, City of Berkeley
FULL TEXT OF MEASURE R

FULL TEXT OF CHARTER AMENDMENT

CHARTER AMENDMENT TO ALLOW
CITY COUNCIL TO ADOPT DECENNIAL
REDISTRICTING PLAN

The People of the City of Berkeley hereby amend the
following sections of the Charter of the City of Berkeley
to read as follows:

Section 1. Section 9 of Article V of the Charter of the City
of Berkeley is amended to read as follows:

Section 9. Election and Districts.
   (a) The Mayor, Auditor and School Directors shall be
elected at the general municipal election on a general ticket
from the City at large.
   (b) The Councilmembers shall be elected at the general
municipal election by districts. The Councilmembers shall
be recalled by districts.
   (c) No later than December 31st of the third year
following the year in which each decennial federal census
is taken, commencing with the 2010 census, the Council
shall by ordinance divide the City into eight Council
districts. Any such redistricting shall become effective as of
the next general election of Councilmembers immediately
following the effective date of said ordinance.

   (1) In establishing and modifying district
boundaries, the Council shall ensure that the districts
continue to be as nearly equal in population as may
be according to the census, taking into consideration
topography, geography, cohesiveness, contiguity, integrity
and compactness of territory of the districts, as well as
existing communities of interest as defined in California
Constitution Article XXI, section 2(d)(4), and shall utilize
easily understood district boundaries such as major traffic
arteries and geographic boundaries to the extent they are
consistent with communities of interest.

   (2) Notwithstanding the foregoing paragraph,
no change in the boundary or location of any district by
redistricting may result in the residences of two sitting
Council members being located in the same district.

The City is hereby divided into eight Council districts
as hereinafter set forth, and, commencing with the general
municipal election in November, 1986 and continuing
thereafter until new districts are established as hereinafter
set forth, such districts shall be used for the election and
recall of Councilmembers and for filling any vacancy in the
office of Councilmember by appointment. If and when
new districts are established, as hereinafter provided, such
new districts shall be used for the aforesaid purposes;
provided, however, that no change in the boundary or
location of any district by redistricting as herein provided
shall operate to abolish or terminate the term of office
of any Councilmember for which such Councilmember was
elected or appointed. The eight Council districts, as
established herein, shall be bounded and described as
follows:

FIRST COUNCIL DISTRICT shall comprise all of that
portion of the City of Berkeley commencing on the point
at the center of the intersection of University Avenue and
Grant Street, thence northerly along the center line of
Grant Street to the center of the intersection of Vine Street;
 thence westerly along the center line of Vine Street to the
center of the intersection of Vine Street and Edith Street;
thence northerly along the center line of Edith Street to the
center of the intersection of Edith Street and Rose Street;
thence westerly along the center line of Rose Street to the
center of the intersection of Rose Street and Sacramento
Street; thence northerly along said northern boundary line
to the west boundary line of the City of Berkeley; thence
westerly along said western boundary line to where it
intersects with a line which is a direct extension of the center
line of University Avenue; thence easterly along said extension
line and along the center line of University Avenue to the
point of beginning.

SECOND COUNCIL DISTRICT shall comprise all of
that portion of the City of Berkeley commencing on the
point on the western boundary line of the City of Berkeley
in the San Francisco Bay where an extension of the center
line of University Avenue would intersect said western
boundary line; thence southerly along said western
boundary line to the southern boundary line of the City of
Berkeley; thence westerly along said southern boundary line
to the intersection of said southern boundary line and
the center line of California Street; thence northerly along
the center line of California Street to the center of the
intersection of California Street and Ashby Avenue; thence
westerly along the center line of Ashby Avenue to the
center of the intersection of Ashby Avenue and Sacramento
Street; thence northerly along the center line of Sacramento
Street to the center of the intersection of Sacramento Street
and University Avenue; thence westerly along the center line
of University Avenue and along an extension of said center
line, to the point of beginning.

THIRD COUNCIL DISTRICT shall comprise all of
that portion of the City of Berkeley commencing on the
point where the southern boundary line of the City of
Berkeley intersects the center line of California Street;
thence westerly along said southern boundary line to the
intersection of said southern boundary line and the center
line of Deakin Street; thence northerly along the center line
of Deakin Street to the center of the intersection of Deakin
Street and Ashby Avenue; thence westerly along the center
line of Ashby Avenue to the center of the intersection of
Ashby Avenue and Ellsworth Street; thence westerly along
the center line of Ellsworth Street to the center of the
intersection of Ellsworth Street and Dwight Way; thence
westerly along the center line of Dwight Way to the center
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of the intersection of Dwight Way and Sacramento Street; thence southerly along the center line of Sacramento Street to the center of the intersection of Sacramento Street and Ashby Avenue; thence easterly along the center line of Ashby Avenue to the center of the intersection of Ashby Avenue and California Street; thence southerly along the center line of California Street to the point of beginning.

FOURTH COUNCIL DISTRICT shall comprise all of that portion of the City of Berkeley commencing on the point at the center of the intersection of Ellsworth Street and Dwight Way; thence northerly along the center line of Ellsworth Street to the center of the intersection of Ellsworth Street and Channing Way; thence westerly along the center line of Channing Way to the center of the intersection of Channing Way and Fulton Street; thence northerly along the center line of Fulton Street to where it becomes Oxford Street and continuing along the center line of Oxford Street to the center of the intersection of Oxford Street and Hearst Avenue; thence easterly along the center line of Hearst Avenue to the center of the intersection of Hearst Avenue, Arch Street and Le Conte Avenue; thence northerly along the center line of Arch Street to the center of Arch Street and Cedar Street; thence westerly along the center line of Cedar Street to the center of the intersection of Cedar Street and Spruce Street; thence northerly along the center line of Spruce Street to the center of the intersection of Spruce Street and Vine Street; thence westerly along the center line of Vine Street to the center of the intersection of Vine Street and Martin Luther King Jr. Way; thence southerly along the center line of Martin Luther King Jr. Way to the intersection of Martin Luther King Jr. Way and Cedar Street; thence westerly along the center line of Cedar Street to the center of the intersection of Cedar Street and Grant Street; thence southerly along the center line of Grant Street to the center of the intersection of Grant Street and University Avenue; thence westerly along the center line of University Avenue to the center of the intersection of University Avenue and Sacramento Street; thence southerly along the center line of Sacramento Street to the intersection of Sacramento Street and Dwight Way; thence easterly along the center line of Dwight Way to the point of beginning.

FIFTH COUNCIL DISTRICT shall comprise all of that portion of the City of Berkeley commencing on the point at the center of the intersection of Spruce Street and Vine Street; thence northerly along the center line of Spruce Street to the center of the intersection of Spruce Street and Grizzly Peak Blvd; thence northerly along the center line of Grizzly Peak Blvd to the northern boundary line of the City of Berkeley; thence westerly and thence southerly along said northern boundary line to the intersection of said boundary line with the center line of Albina Avenue; thence southerly along the center line of Albina Avenue to the center of the intersection of Albina Avenue and Hopkins Court; thence easterly along the center line of Hopkins Court to the center of the intersection of Hopkins Court and Ashby Avenue; thence westerly along the center line of Hopkins Court to the center of the intersection of Hopkins Street and Sacramento Street; thence southerly along the center line of Sacramento Street to the center of the intersection of Sacramento Street and Rose Street; thence easterly along the center line of Rose Street to the center of the intersection of Rose Street and Edith Street; thence southerly along the center line of Edith Street to the center of the intersection of Edith Street and Vine Street; thence easterly along the center line of Vine Street to the center of the intersection of Vine Street and Grant Street; thence southerly along the center of Grant Street to the center of the intersection of Grant Street and Cedar Street; thence easterly along the center line of Cedar Street to the center of the intersection of Cedar Street and Martin Luther King Jr. Way; thence northerly along the center line of Martin Luther King Jr. Way to the center of the intersection of Martin Luther King Jr. Way and Vine Street; thence easterly along the center line of Vine Street to the point of beginning.

SIXTH COUNCIL DISTRICT shall comprise all that portion of the City of Berkeley commencing on the point at the center of the intersection of Arch Street, Le Conte Avenue and Hearst Avenue; thence easterly along the center line of Hearst Avenue, and along a direct extension of the center line of Hearst Avenue, to the point where it intersects the boundary line of the campus of the University of California, which boundary line is also the boundary line of federal census tract number 4226, thence northerly, and thence easterly, along said boundary line to where it intersects the eastern boundary line of the City of Berkeley; thence northerly along said eastern boundary line to the intersection of said boundary line and the center line of Grizzly Peak Blvd.; thence southerly along the center line of Grizzly Peak Blvd. to the center of the intersection of Grizzly Peak Blvd. and Spruce Street; thence westerly and southerly along the center line of Spruce Street to the center of the intersection of Spruce Street and Cedar Street; thence easterly along the center line of Cedar Street to the center of the intersection of Cedar Street and Arch Street; thence southerly along the center line of Arch Street to the point of beginning.

SEVENTH COUNCIL DISTRICT shall comprise all that portion of the City of Berkeley commencing at the point on the southern boundary line of the City of Berkeley where it intersects the center line of Deakin Street; thence easterly along said southern boundary line to the intersection of said southern boundary line and the center line of College Avenue; thence northerly along the center line of College Avenue to the center of the intersection of College Avenue and Grizzly Peak Blvd; thence westerly along the center line of Grizzly Peak Blvd. to the northern boundary line of the City of Berkeley; thence westerly and thence southerly along said northern boundary line to the intersection of said boundary line with the center line of Albina Avenue; thence southerly along the center line of Albina Avenue to the center of the intersection of Albina Avenue and Hopkins Court; thence easterly along the center line of Hopkins Court to the center of the intersection of Hopkins Court and Ashby Avenue; thence westerly along the center line of Hopkins Court to the center of the intersection of Hopkins Street and Sacramento Street; thence southerly along the center line of Sacramento Street to the center of the intersection of Sacramento Street and Rose Street; thence easterly along the center line of Rose Street to the center of the intersection of Rose Street and Edith Street; thence southerly along the center line of Edith Street to the center of the intersection of Edith Street and Vine Street; thence easterly along the center line of Vine Street to the center of the intersection of Vine Street and Grant Street; thence southerly along the center of Grant Street to the center of the intersection of Grant Street and Cedar Street; thence easterly along the center line of Cedar Street to the center of the intersection of Cedar Street and Martin Luther King Jr. Way; thence northerly along the center line of Martin Luther King Jr. Way to the center of the intersection of Martin Luther King Jr. Way and Vine Street; thence easterly along the center line of Vine Street to the point of beginning.
along the center line of Gayley Road to the center of the intersection of Gayley Road and Hearst Avenue; thence westerly along the centerline of Hearst Avenue to the center of the intersection of Hearst Avenue and Oxford Street; thence southerly along the center line of Oxford Street to where it becomes Fulton Street and continuing southerly along the center line of Fulton Street to the center of the intersection of Fulton Street and Channing Way; thence easterly along the center line of Channing Way to the center of the intersection of Channing Way and Ellsworth Street; thence southerly along the center line of Ellsworth Street to the center of the intersection of Ellsworth Street and Ashby Avenue; thence westerly along the center line of Ashby Avenue to the center of the intersection of Ashby Avenue and Deakin Street; thence southerly along the center line of Deakin Street to the point of beginning.

EIGHTH COUNCIL DISTRICT shall comprise all of that portion of the City not otherwise described as constituting the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Seventh Council Districts.

The Council shall, by ordinance, adjust if necessary the boundaries of the Council districts herein set forth by December 31st of the third year following the year in which each decennial federal census is taken, commencing with the 2010 census, as provided and required in the Constitution and statutes of the State of California and in order that the eight Council districts shall continue to be as nearly equal in population as may be according to said census. Any such redistricting shall preserve, to the extent possible, the Council districts originally established herein and shall become effective as of the next general election of Councilmembers immediately following the effective date of said ordinance.

Commencing with the general municipal election in November 1986.

(d) Each Councilmember shall be elected by the electors within a Council district, must have resided in the District in which he or she is elected for a period of not less than thirty days immediately preceding the date he or she files a declaration of candidacy for the office of Councilmember, must continue to reside therein during his or her incumbency, and shall be removed from office upon ceasing to be such resident.

(e) The candidate receiving the highest number of votes for the offices, respectively, of Mayor, Auditor and Councilmembers of the City shall be elected to such offices, provided that such candidate receives at least 40% of the votes cast for each such office. In the event that no candidate for Mayor, Auditor and Councilmember for one or more Council offices receives at least 40% of the votes cast for that office, then there shall be a runoff election between the two candidates receiving the most votes, which runoff election shall be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in February of the odd numbered year following the initial election. No other issues shall appear on the ballot of any runoff election. The successful candidate in any runoff election shall assume office on March 1, after the election results have been declared by the Council. If the provisions of Article III, Section 5, Paragraph 12 related to instant runoff voting are operative, the vote threshold requirements in this section shall have no application to municipal elections.

(f) Should any provision of the amendment of this section be held invalid, the remainder of this section the amendment shall not be affected thereby, and such word, phrase, sentence, part, section, subsection, or other portion shall be severable, and the remaining provisions of this section shall remain in full force and effect. The voters hereby declares that they would have passed this section and each subsection, sentence, clause and phrase thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more, subsections, sentences, clauses or phrases had been declared invalid.

Section 2, Section 5, subdivision 12 of Article III of the Charter of the City of Berkeley is amended to read as follows:

(12) Use of instant runoff voting in lieu of runoff elections.

For purposes of this charter “instant runoff voting” shall refer to a voting system which, in a single election, determines the candidate supported by the voters. Notwithstanding any section of this Charter to the contrary, upon a determination by the City Council of all of the following, that: a) the voting equipment and procedures are technically ready to handle instant runoff voting in municipal elections; b) instant runoff voting will not preclude the City from consolidating its municipal elections with the County; and c) instant runoff elections will not result in additional City election costs, the Council may by ordinance establish a system of instant runoff voting for the offices of Mayor, City Council, and Auditor in any manner permitted by the State of California Elections Code. Once the Council institutes a system of instant runoff voting, future elections shall be conducted as instant runoff voting elections, unless the Council finds that circumstances have changed such that one or more of the prior Council findings required by this section are no longer valid. In such case, the Council shall articulate the specific basis therefore in order to suspend an existing system of instant runoff voting.

Subdivision (e) The fourteenth paragraph of Section 9 of Article V relating to the percentage threshold to trigger a runoff election shall have no application to a system of instant runoff voting. The City Clerk shall conduct voter and community education to familiarize voters with instant runoff voting.
CITY ATTORNEY’S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE S

This measure would prohibit any person from sitting on a sidewalk in a commercial zoning district from 7:00 a.m. until 10:00 p.m., subject to the following exceptions:

1. Due to a medical emergency;
2. On a wheelchair or other device that is needed for mobility;
3. On a public bench or bus stop bench that is permanently affixed to the sidewalk; or
4. As authorized by a City-issued permit, such as a permit for a Street Event, or for public benches or outside café seating.

This measure would also provide that it could not be applied or enforced in a manner that violates the United States or California constitutions, and would require the City to ensure that it is applied in a constitutional manner and requiring a warning prior to citation, be approved?

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE S

Berkeley takes pride in being a humanitarian city. Berkeley was early in setting up services for people who were forced out of State institutions. Berkeley taxpayer’s yearly fund more than $2,800,000 to those in need. Yet, there are some who resist our help, preferring to encamp on shopping streets creating unsanitary conditions for themselves and residents. Drugs, alcohol, and/or mental illness cause behavior that can be perceived as menacing, keeping shoppers away and hurting local merchants trying to make ends meet in a tough economy.

Living on the street is unhealthy. It sends people into a downward spiral. Berkeley offers comprehensive social services that are successful in finding treatment and homes for people who participate.

Measure S (Berkeley Civil Sidewalks) has two goals: taking the initiative to help people into services and preventing street encampments that keep shoppers away from our businesses. Measure S will prevent sitting on commercial sidewalks during the day. Outreach will take place before implementation, and Ambassadors will encourage individuals into city services. If the Ambassadors are repeatedly unsuccessful, citations will follow. However, Berkeley will erase those citations for the person entering and participating in services.

Measure S is supported by a broad coalition of neighborhood merchants, residents and parent groups. Confrontational behaviors from people who block sidewalks for hours at a time create an unacceptable environment for the “mom and pop” merchants who pay the taxes that fund the services, grow local jobs and make Berkeley a special place to live.

Measure S is based on successful laws implemented in over 60 cities, but with the addition of several improvements that ensure we are helping people find services.

Vote Yes on S. Help people get social services, help merchants grow local jobs, and ensure civil and welcoming sidewalks for everyone.

s/Tom Bates
Mayor City of Berkeley
s/James C. Young
Partner - Paul’s Shoe Repair
s/Erin Rhoades
Chair, Livable Berkeley
s/Craig Becker
Owner, Caffe Mediterraneum
s/Susan Wengraf
Berkeley City Councilmember

Shall an ordinance prohibiting sitting on sidewalks in commercial districts from 7:00 am to 10:00 pm, with exceptions for: (a) medical emergencies; (b) wheelchairs and similar mobility devices; (c) bus benches; (d) street events; (e) other furniture placed on the sidewalk pursuant to a permit; requiring the City to ensure that it is applied in a constitutional manner and requiring a warning prior to citation, be approved?
REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE S

Our community has a tradition of compassionate, sensible problem-solving. Where other cities scapegoat, Berkeley seeks real solutions.

Criminalizing sitting is a proven failure: San Francisco’s law has failed “to improve merchant corridors, serve as a useful tool for SFPD, connect services to those who violate the law, and positively contribute to public safety,” according to a report commissioned by the San Francisco Controller’s Office. Imitating other cities’ failures doesn’t help businesses and hurts poor people. This is not how Berkeley solves problems.

Measure S will divert police resources from preventing and solving real crimes. It will push unsheltered teens into a futile cycle of warrants, jail time, and back into the streets. The ACLU calls Measure S “an infringement of civil rights and civil liberties.”

Poor people do not choose to rest in public. We have no drop-in center for homeless youth. Our youth shelter is open only six months a year. Neither the youth shelter nor the adult shelter is open during the day. There are four homeless people in Berkeley for every shelter bed. The “ambassadors”—hired to clean downtown streets—are not trained in mental health or homeless outreach.

We can do better than this. Instead of wasting city money on proven failures, we can fully fund a youth shelter, provide enough shelter beds, and more public restrooms. Instead of pushing people out of our shared public spaces, we can unite to create real solutions for the economic problems that plague small businesses. Vote No on Proposition S.

s/Jesse Arreguín
Berkeley City Councilmember

s/Elisa Della-Piana
Civil Rights Attorney, East Bay Community Law Center

s/Branden Ignacio Figueroa
Student Organization Coordinator

s/Mary Dirks
Owner, Café

s/Rabbi David J. Cooper
Rabbi, Kehilla Community Synagogue

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE S

Can you imagine getting arrested for sitting down on a public sidewalk? In Berkeley?

If Measure S passes, anybody could be cited or arrested for this simple act—yet another law restricting the public space we all share. But it also sets a dangerous precedent, discriminating against an entire class of people who happen to be poor. These are not Berkeley values.

The street behavior used to justify this measure is already illegal. This measure will harm public safety by diverting police resources away from solving real crimes.

Measure S won’t help business. A similar law in San Francisco had no effect on improving merchant corridors, helping homeless people obtain services, reducing the number of homeless people on the street, or increasing public safety.

Throwing people in jail is no solution to homelessness. Instead, it creates a problem for all of us. The U. S. Interagency Council on Homelessness has found that when people are arrested or fined for “act of living” crimes in public spaces, it makes it more difficult for them to find work and receive services and housing. This measure is a step backwards.

Berkeley has the largest gap between rich and poor in the Bay Area—we need serious solutions, not laws criminalizing the act of sitting down. This measure offers no solutions for businesses, customers, or homeless people.

Join the ACLU, small businesses, Berkeley community organizations, and faith groups to VOTE NO on this extraordinary waste of money and police resources. Stand up for the simple human right to sit down, to rest, and to share our common public space.

Let’s come together, as one Berkeley, and find real solutions that help our communities.

Visit www.noonsberkeley.com. KEEP SITTING LEGAL. Vote NO on Measure S.

s/Max Anderson
Berkeley City Council

s/Kriss Worthington
Berkeley City Council

s/Satinder Boona Cheema
Executive Director Homeless Service Provider, Activist

s/Nolan Pack
Senator, Associated Students of the University of California

s/Eleanor Walden
Senior Housing Activist
REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST
MEASURE S

Don’t believe the scare tactics being used by the opponents of Measure S the Berkeley Civil Sidewalks Ordinance.

Ordinances like Measure S have already saved jobs in merchant areas and have slowed the downward spiral that comes with living on the sidewalks. **Yes on S will help people get the critical services they NEED to transform their lives.**

Similar ordinances have improved commercial areas in Santa Cruz, Santa Monica, San Francisco and 60 cities. It has passed extensive judicial review and only Berkeley’s version includes both outreach from our Ambassadors and waiving citations in exchange for services.

**It is not a progressive value to watch people wither away on sidewalks day after day,** becoming more unstable and abusing their bodies with alcohol and drugs.

**It is not responsible to disregard that reality and ignore its impact on neighborhood businesses.** Local jobs are critical for working families who are barely staying afloat in an economy that has been too harsh for too long.

**It is not compassionate to do nothing** about a harmful situation and support the status quo.

**Yes on S will help people get the services they need to transform their lives.** Berkeley spends over $2,800,000 on comprehensive social services and we have real solutions to help people transition from the streets to stable environments. That will continue.

**Measure S will help people and will save local jobs.** Measure S encourages alternatives to street life and safer sidewalks for everyone.

**Vote Yes on S, Berkeley Civil Sidewalks**

Berkeleycivilsidewalks.com

---

s/Laurie Capitelli
Berkeley City Councilmember
s/James C. Young
Partner - Paul’s Shoe Repair
s/Erin Rhoades
Chair, Livable Berkeley
s/Craig Becker
Owner, Caffe Meditarraneum
s/Tom Bates
Mayor, City of Berkeley
FULL TEXT OF MEASURE S
ORDINANCE NO. #,### - N.S.
AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF BERKELEY
ADOPTING NEW SECTION 13.36.025 OF THE
BERKELEY MUNICIPAL CODE TO PROHIBIT
SITTING ON SIDEWALKS IN COMMERCIAL
DISTRICTS
THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF BERKELEY ORDAIN
AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Findings
The People of the City of Berkeley find as follows:

A. In FY 2012 the City of Berkeley devoted more
than $2.8 million to services for the homeless, mentally
ill, and other disadvantaged residents, including meals,
shelters, transitional and permanent housing with
supportive services, daytime drop-in centers, health
services, employment programs, alcohol and other drug
treatment and rehabilitation, case management, and legal
services. Residents, taxpayers, and business owners of
Berkeley share the consensus that the City should continue
to provide this funding subject to resource constraints and
taking into account other needs such as public safety and
our City’s infrastructure.

B. Public spaces in commercial districts have become
increasingly inhospitable due to groups of individuals,
often with dogs, having created encampments on sidewalk
areas on our commercial streets. These encampments
obstruct pedestrian access, and result in litter, debris, and
waste left on our sidewalks.

C. City parks are open and available during the day for
everyone’s use.

D. As a result of the sidewalk encampments, residents
and visitors tend to avoid some of our commercial areas,
which threatens the viability of Berkeley’s businesses that
are already struggling. This in turn threatens the City’s
overall economic health. Reduced economic activity
results in fewer resources available for homeless services.

E. Although state and local laws address various
specific problematic behaviors and actions associated
with encampments of people and dogs on the sidewalks,
enforcement of such laws to an extent sufficient to reverse
the trend described above is infeasible, as it would require
a level of police resources that are simply not available,
and would divert public safety resources from more serious
Crimes.

F. The only practical solution is to limit sitting on
sidewalks only in commercial districts at certain hours of
the day, and to require a warning before citation.

G. The purpose of this ordinance is solely to address
the deleterious impacts of encampments on public
sidewalks. Accordingly, it is the intent of the voters that
the ordinance be interpreted and applied in a manner that
does not discriminate against homeless, mentally ill or
other residents of the City based on their status.

H. Because the intent of the voters is not to criminalize
persons for sitting on the sidewalk given that other options
are available (permanently-affixed public benches, bus
stop benches, low walls, etc.), this ordinance shall not take
effect until July 1, 2013, so that comprehensive outreach
and education can be conducted, involving homeless and
youth service providers, merchants, community agencies
and City staff including police. Other methods, such as
signage, will also be employed.

Section 2. Adoption of Ordinance.
That a new Section 13.36.025 is hereby added to the
Berkeley Municipal Code to read as follows:

Section 13.36.025 - Prohibiting Sitting on Commercial
Sidewalks at Certain Times - Exceptions.

A. Prohibiting Sitting on Commercial Sidewalks
at Certain Times. No person shall sit on a Commercial
Sidewalk or on any object brought or affixed to said
sidewalk, from 7:00 a.m. until 10:00 p.m., except as
provided in this Section.

B. Exceptions. This Section shall not apply to any
person sitting on a commercial sidewalk:

1. Due to a medical emergency;

2. On a wheelchair or other device that is needed
for mobility;

3. On a public bench or bus stop bench that is
permanently affixed to the sidewalk; or

4. As authorized by a City-issued permit, such
as a permit for a Street Event, a permit under Sections
14.48.170 or 14.48.200, or other City permit.

This Section shall not be construed to prohibit persons
from obtaining such City permits.

These exceptions shall not be construed to allow
conduct that is prohibited by other laws.

C. This Section shall not be applied or enforced in
a manner that violates the United States or California
constitutions. Prior to enforcement of this Section, the City
shall develop and adopt rules, regulations and procedures
to ensure that it is not applied or enforced in a manner that
violates the United States or California constitutions.

D. Necessity of Warning Prior to Citation. No person
may be cited for a violation of this Section until a peace
officer first warns said person that his or her conduct is
unlawful and said person is given a chance to stop said
conduct. One warning by a peace officer to a person who
is violating this Section is sufficient for a 30-day period as
to any subsequent violations of this Section by said person
during said period.

E. Commercial Sidewalk - Definition. As used in this
Section, “Commercial Sidewalk” means all sidewalks in
front of or adjoining property designated on the City’s
Official Zoning Map with a “C” prefix.

F. Violation - Infraction or Misdemeanor. A first
violation of this Section shall be charged only as an
infraction subject to either a $75 fine or community
service. Subsequent violations may be charged as either
an infraction or a misdemeanor.
Section 3. Amendment of Ordinance.

Section 13.36.025 of the Berkeley Municipal Code as adopted by this Ordinance may be repealed or amended by the City Council without a vote of the people.

Section 4. Severability.

If any section, sentence, clause, phrase, or portion of this Ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid or unenforceable by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining sections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or portions of this ordinance shall nonetheless remain in full force and effect. The people of the City of Berkeley hereby declare that they would have adopted each section, sentence, clause, phrase, or portion of this Ordinance, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or portions of this Ordinance be declared invalid or unenforceable and, to that end, the provisions of this Ordinance are severable.

Section 5. Majority Approval; Effective Date; Execution.

This Ordinance shall be effective only if approved by a majority of the voters voting thereon and shall go into effect on July 1, 2013. The Mayor and City Clerk are hereby authorized to execute this Ordinance to give evidence of its adoption by the voters.
CITY ATTORNEY’S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE T

This measure would amend the West Berkeley Plan (“Plan”) and the Zoning Ordinance to allow more flexibility in development of large parcels in West Berkeley that are under the same ownership, if they are approved through the Master Use Permit (“MUP”) process.

Currently, only sites of at least four acres under the same ownership are eligible for MUPs. This measure would make sites under 4 acres under the same ownership that also comprise a full city block eligible, and would limit MUPs to parcels that were eligible on August 1, 2011.

Only 6 MUPs could be approved during the next 10 years; after that there would be no limitation.

Material amendments:

Increased residential density in Mixed Use – Residential (“MU-R”) areas within MUP sites. Currently, the density in MU-R areas is one unit for every 1,250 square feet of land area. The amendments would remove that limitation for MU-R areas that are part of a MUP site.

Additional development flexibility. Development standards for MUP sites would be revised to allow alteration of nine lot development standards if certain findings are made. The main development standards that could be altered are:

- Height could be increased in areas of MUP sites zoned for manufacturing from 45 feet to 75 feet. Height limits in areas of MUP sites zoned for commercial uses would be unchanged (maximum of 50 feet for a mixed use building except as allowed by state density bonus law). Height limits in areas of MUP sites in the MU-R district would be increased to a maximum of 45 feet except as allowed by state density bonus law, with additional limitations on height at the property line for areas adjacent to MU-R areas that are not part of the MUP site.
- MUPs would be limited to a site – wide average height of 50’.
- Required parking could be reduced by up to 50%.
- The floor area ratio of an MUP site would be increased from 2.0 to a maximum of 3.0, except in MU-R portions where the maximum would be 1.5.
- Certain uses allowed in Mixed Use – Light Industrial (“MU-LI”) zones but not in MU-R zones could be placed anywhere within a MUP site, subject to findings and limitations. Four types of uses would be excluded from MU-R areas: construction products manufacturing; pharmaceutical manufacturing; testing and commercial biological research laboratories; and commercial excavation. No Research and Development allowed in a MU-LI district could be located in a MU-R district without specific findings of compatibility.

Community benefits. No MUP could be approved until the City Council has adopted requirements for community benefits that would have to be provided by any MUP, but which could not otherwise be required.

Aquatic Park protections. No MUP would be approved adjacent to Aquatic Park until the City Council has adopted specific protection measures for Aquatic Park.

The Council could amend this measure but could not increase the aggregate amount of development allowed.

s/ZACH COWAN
Berkeley City Attorney
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE T

Measure T is neither a tax increase nor an approval of a specific development project. Measure T is a creative, community-based initiative that will allow hundreds of good paying jobs, affordable housing opportunities and improvements in West Berkeley, with the potential to generate millions of dollars in revenue for enhanced amenities and services to the community. Measure T will amend the original, restrictive West Berkeley Plan that is now out of step with today’s global and regional economy. Recent analysis indicates more than 1500 jobs were lost in West Berkeley due to outdated zoning. More than 75 open public meetings have been held to discuss West Berkeley zoning over the past seven years. In 2011, the Council approved allowing new types of uses in West Berkeley including research and development. Now, as proposed Under Measure T, owners of large sites could either use existing zoning laws or choose the new zoning and gain the flexibility to mix uses (light manufacturing, residential, artist work space, research and development) in exchange for community benefits. Each proposed site would be discussed in numerous public meetings and follow the city’s planning and review process: design review, landmark approval, planning commission approval, and City Council approval.

There are large West Berkeley industrial sites that are underutilized; Measure T provides the tools to revitalize these properties. If property owners use the new flexible zoning, millions of dollars of new funds would become available to support needed city amenities and services such as job training, good paying jobs, affordable housing, and artists work space, public safety, education, parks and enhanced transportation and environmental improvements.

Join us in voting Yes on Measure T to bring needed changes to West Berkeley and necessary revenue to support the entire city. Together, we can move Berkeley into the 21st century.

s/Nancy Skinner
Assemblymember
s/Joseph Slusky
Artist, Sculptor
s/Susan Medak
Managing Director, Local Theatre Company
s/Linda Schacht
University Lecturer
s/Tom Bates
Mayor, City of Berkeley

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE T

The arguments in favor of Measure T are false and misleading.

Far from being “community-based,” Measure T is backed by a few large landholders in West Berkeley who would profit greatly from its passage. Thousands of people living and working west of San Pablo never received a single notice about this proposed rezoning of their homes and businesses.

Measure T’s proponents say “large West Berkeley industrial sites are underutilized.” In fact, West Berkeley industry is thriving. West Berkeley manufacturing space has a vacancy rate of 2.9%, the lowest manufacturing vacancy rate in the East Bay.

Thanks to existing zoning that keeps space affordable, West Berkeley is home to hundreds of skilled light manufacturers, artists and artisans—bakers, brewers, printers, filmmakers, painters, potters, woodworkers, makers of musical instruments, scientific glass and many other specialized products.

West Berkeley has 850,000 square feet of R & D occupied by numerous cutting edge firms.

What Measure T’s proponents call “flexibility” is really a deregulation of land use that would invite real estate speculation and displace many established businesses and good jobs.

The claim that Measure T provides “new funds” to “support the entire city” is fantasy.

But Measure T would affect all of Berkeley—negatively—by damaging the city’s environment. Massive development would pollute Berkeley’s air, darken West Berkeley streets, block views of the bay and hills and clog major intersections with traffic.

For the sake of Berkeley’s economy and environment, Vote NO on Measure T.

Visit SaveWestBerkeley.org.

s/Steven Sullivan
President and Co-Founder, Acme Bread
s/Mark Liolios
Director, Aquatic Park EGRET; Environmentalist
s/Klein Lieu
ASUC Senator
s/N. Jed Riffe
West Berkeley Resident, Homeowner; Independent Filmmaker & New Media Producer
s/C. Mark Humbert
President, Claremont Elmwood Neighborhood Association
ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE T

VOTE NO on MEASURE T.

Protect Aquatic Park and a thriving community from drastic, needless rezoning.

West Berkeley is home to diverse neighborhoods and an array of artisans and businesses providing 16,000 jobs—a center of commerce and innovation where things are invented and produced.

Measure T is unnecessary for growth. Recent zoning changes provide ample opportunity for development compatible with existing businesses and neighborhoods.

Measure T would confer extraordinary benefits on a handful of corporate developers, encouraging land speculation and higher rents that would force out many artisans, artists and businesses that contribute to Berkeley’s economy.

Measure T would alter the zoning in West Berkeley on at least 109 acres (about 50 city blocks). After 10 years the number of eligible sites is indefinite.

Measure T would allow 75-foot high multi-block office parks and 6-story apartment buildings next to modest single-family homes.

Measure T would allow huge buildings next to Aquatic Park. The City Council rejected protections for the park and its wildlife that were recommended by Citizens for East Shore Parks, the Audubon Society and the Sierra Club.

Measure T betrays Berkeley’s commitment to environmental leadership. The City’s Environmental Impact Report showed that the allowable new development would worsen air pollution, block views of the Bay, shadow large parts of West Berkeley and gridlock major intersections on Gilman, San Pablo, Ashby and University.

Measure T provides no guaranteed community benefits to compensate for the damage to the local environment and quality of life.

Measure T was advanced without notifying the thousands of residents and business owners west of San Pablo Avenue, yet it was overwhelmingly opposed by citizens at numerous City Council meetings.

Join us in opposing this harmful measure.

Save Aquatic Park and West Berkeley’s unique, vibrant neighborhoods and economy.

VOTE NO on MEASURE T.

s/Sylvia McLaughlin
  Co-founder, Save San Francisco Bay Movement
s/Jesse Arreguín
  Berkeley City Councilmember
s/Max Anderson
  Berkeley City Councilmember
s/Judy Dater
  Photographer/Artist/West Berkeley Resident
s/Isabelle Gaston
  President of NEBA (Northeast Berkeley Association)

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE T

ARGUMENTS AGAINST MEASURE T ARE OUT- RAGEOUS DISTORTIONS AND HALF-TRUTHS.

Measure T does not include Aquatic Park. Aquatic Park was specifically removed from Measure T when the Citizens for East Bay Shoreline Park, Sierra Club and the Audubon Society raised concerns. It is disingenuous for opponents to say Aquatic Park will change under Measure T. They know full well it is not included in this measure.

Measure T (West Berkeley’s voluntary plan) has been considered for 7 years in more than 75 community meetings. Saying it hasn’t been discussed by the community is not true.

Only six sites in West Berkeley, totaling approximately 40 acres, not 150 acres as opponents would have you believe, are eligible.

Opponents say everything is fine in West Berkeley, but we have lost over 1500 jobs. Measure T is necessary to bring back jobs and provide space for emerging startup companies.

Opponents say there will be tall buildings throughout West Berkeley, but Measure T limits building heights to designated areas and only allows buildings of up to 75 feet, with an average height of only 5 feet higher than currently allowed.

Measure T is voluntary zoning. If property owners want to use it they must enter into a binding development agreement that guarantees community benefits like job training and affordable housing.

Measure T will help meet the goals of Berkeley’s climate action plan by providing housing near jobs.

Reject the exaggerations, distortions, and half-truths.

Vote yes on Measure T for jobs and economic progress.

s/Susan Medak
  Managing Director, Local Theater Company
s/Gordon Wozniak
  Berkeley City Councilmember
s/Katie Hawkinson
  Artist, Educator
s/Victoria Eisen
  Planning Commission Chair, Transportation Planner
s/Laurie Capitelli
  Berkeley City Councilmember
THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF BERKELEY ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Findings.
The People of the City of Berkeley find as follows:

A. The City of Berkeley ("City") adopted the West Berkeley Plan in 1993; and adopted Zoning Ordinance amendments to implement that Plan in 1999.

B. Beginning in 2006, the City Council requested that staff revise land use regulations in West Berkeley to allow flexibility to facilitate development of large multi-parcel sites and to encourage building reuse and expansion.

C. In addition to various Zoning Ordinance revisions, the revised regulations include revisions to the Land Use Chapter of the West Berkeley Plan, Section VII. Land Use Regulations of the West Berkeley Plan – For Adoption in Principle to reflect the proposed changes to zoning regulations.

D. The West Berkeley Plan is incorporated by reference into the General Plan, and therefore such revisions are also amendments to the General Plan.

E. The City has prepared an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) on the revised regulations and the City Council has certified those documents.

F. On June 12, 2012, the Council adopted Resolution No. 65,782-N.S. certifying the EIR as supplemented by the SEIR with respect to the plan and zoning amendments set forth in this measure.

G. The proposed amendments to the West Berkeley Plan Land Use Chapter, Section VII. Land Use Regulations of the West Berkeley Plan – For Adoption in Principle are consistent with the Purposes of the West Berkeley Plan, including maintaining the full range of land uses and economic activities, maintaining the ethnic and economic diversity, and maintaining and improving the quality of life.

H. The proposed amendments are also consistent with West Berkeley Plan goals and policies, including, but not limited to allowing modification to zoning regulations to improve the West Berkeley industrial business climate, to attract emerging businesses, and to retain, to the degree feasible, the economic diversity of West Berkeley businesses, and especially space for artists and craftspeople and jobs for residents of Berkeley who may be underemployed or unemployed.

Section 2. Amendment of West Berkeley Plan and General Plan.
The West Berkeley Plan is hereby amended as follows, and the General Plan, of which the West Berkeley is a part, is hereby also amended by reference in the same manner.

A. Revision to Table 1-5, “Recommended Development Standards by Zone”, page 53. The Residential Density standard for the Mixed-Use Residential zone is amended as follows:

- Residential Density: max. 1 unit/1,250 sq. ft. land, except for Master Use Permit sites.

B. The “Large Site Development Process”, page 56 is amended to read:

Rationale:

West Berkeley has a few large sites—sites of 5 acres or more under a single ownership—which present special challenges and opportunities for planning and development in West Berkeley. These large sites—such as the Miles or (ex)Colgate property—are of a scale where they have a major impact on the area around them, and noticeable impacts on West Berkeley as a whole. They also may require modification of the uses and development standards in a district to facilitate a feasible large scale project.

For these reasons, the West Berkeley Plan incorporates a concept of a Large Site Development Process. While the process remains to be defined, the concept is that a special approval process would be used for certain projects. Because of the importance of these projects, the Planning Commission would be involved in the process. The process would also provide a formal mechanism for early citizen input. The rezoning will propose a Zoning Ordinance amendment to provide for a Master Plan Permit. It would be a middle ground alternative between the Use Permit and the Development Agreement. While a master permit could be issued for a multi-building project, there would be a procedure for review of individual buildings at their time of construction. This alternative could incorporate many of the master planning features of a Development Agreement, but would be acted upon under the procedures of the Zoning Ordinance, rather than as a separate contract.

It is important to note that no special process would be required of large scale projects which conform in all substantive respects to the uses and development standard of their district. Such a project, however large, would require simply the normal Use Permit(s) and environmental review (an Environmental Impact Report or other appropriate documentation).

2012 Update: The Master Use Permit (MUP) section of the Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 23B.36) is modified. The Regulations noted in the Plan are no longer accurate. Please reference the proposed revisions to Chapter 23B.36 for the updated Master Use Permit regulations.

Regulation:
Projects which are eligible for the Large Site Development Process are those which:

- Are located on sites of at least 4 acres or one full City block under the same ownership; and

- Proposing to incorporate uses which would not otherwise be permitted in the district, but would be permitted in other zoned land within the
• Requesting an “alternative” land use entitlement, such as a Development Agreement. Another possibility is a Master Plan Permit, whereby a single permit would be issued for the development of a number of buildings and/or uses within a given range.

Section 3. Amendment of Zoning Ordinance.

Chapter 23B.36 of the Berkeley Municipal Code is repealed and reenacted to reads as follows:

Chapter 23B.36

MASTER USE PERMITS

23B.36.010 Applicability

23B.36.020 Purposes

23B.36.030 Master Use Permit Application—Process

23B.36.040 Reserved

23B.36.050 Permissible Alterations of Development Standards and Permitted Uses

23B.36.060 Master Use Permit excludes other alterations of development standards

23B.36.070 Contents of Master use Permit

23B.36.080 Vesting

23B.36.090 Findings

23B.36.010 Applicability

This Chapter applies to sites that met and continue to meet the eligibility requirements set forth in this Section as of August 1, 2011, and is limited to the sites as they existed at that time.

A. In order for a site to be eligible for a Master Use Permit (“MUP”), at least 50% of its land area must be:

1. located in one or more of the MU-LI, MM, or M districts;
2. the site must consist of either
   a. at least 4 contiguous acres in area under the same ownership (whether or not in a single parcel); or
   b. a full city block under the same ownership (whether or not in a single parcel);

B. An MUP site may include property located in the C-W or M-UR districts subject to the additional regulations in Section 23B.36.050.A.

C. The City may not approve more than 6 MUPs during the 10 years immediately following the effective date of this Chapter.

D. Notwithstanding Section 23B.56.100, an MUP project shall secure a building permit within 24 months of the project’s approval. Failure to do so may result in the lapse of the MUP, pursuant to Chapter 23B.56. Once lapsed, that MUP shall not be counted for purposes of this Section.

E. For purposes of this Chapter, parcels shall be considered to be in the “same ownership” if the same person or entity has a greater than 50% ownership of each parcel.

23B.36.020 Purposes

The purposes of this Chapter are to provide flexibility in zoning requirements for projects in West Berkeley that are located on large sites in order to:

A. Facilitate the implementation of the West Berkeley Plan;
B. Facilitate the reuse of large and multi-user sites which might otherwise prove difficult to reuse;
C. Facilitate the development and reuse of large, multi-user sites as integrated units, designed to produce an environment of stable and desirable character that will benefit the occupants, the neighborhood, and the city as a whole;
D. Consolidate the review of the impacts of the development and reuse of large and multi-user projects;
E. Improve Berkeley’s competitiveness in attracting, incubating, retaining and growing businesses by allowing businesses to develop and commence operation on a site quickly once overall development requirements have been established;

F. Attract and retain businesses, especially those engaged in diverse, comparatively clean, and environmentally beneficial industrial activities;

G. Attract businesses in emerging sectors of the economy;

H. Retain and provide space for artists;

I. Reduce or mitigate circulation, access and parking problems by improving transportation infrastructure, reducing vehicle use by employees and providing adequate parking;

J. Expand the availability of and access to jobs and job training programs; and

K. Raise funds for programs and initiatives that further the goals and purposes of the West Berkeley Area Plan.

23B.36.030 Master Use Permit Application — Process

A. Master Use Permit applications shall include:

1. all materials required by Section 23B.24.030, except that they shall not be required to include architectural plans or drawings for phases subsequent to the first phase(s);

2. a detailed phasing plan that shows the character, scale, general location and timing of all physical development, including on- and off-site infrastructure, and locations of proposed uses;

3. a proposed benefits package that is consistent with 23B.36.090.B. The proposed benefits package must include benefits beyond what would otherwise be provided and must specify the types of benefits, the method of delivering and guaranteeing these benefits, and their net present value. In addition, the proposal must demonstrate how the proposed benefits are a reasonable exchange for the requested changes in development standards for the proposed project, recognizing that the zoning ordinance does not require the benefits to equal or exceed the full value to the developer of such modifications to
development standards. The City may require the applicant to pay for an independent consultant to provide technical assistance to the City in reviewing the information provided. Measures to mitigate the land use impacts of the proposed project shall not be considered benefits under this Chapter; and

4. the applicant’s commitment to enter into a binding Community Benefits Agreement that meets the City’s requirements to guarantee provision of the proposed benefits if the application is approved.

B. Applications for Master Use Permits shall be subject to the provisions under Chapter 23B.32, except that the public notice area required by 23B.32.020 shall be expanded to five hundred (500) feet of the subject property and notice of public hearing shall be posted and mailed 30 days in advance.

23B.36.040 Reserved

23B.36.050 Permissible Alterations of Development Standards and Permitted Uses

A. An applicant for a Master Use Permit may request, and the Board may approve, the following alterations to the lot development standards and permissible uses set forth in the underlying applicable zoning district regulations:

1. Parking Requirements: Reduction of off-street parking requirements of up to 50%;

2. Height Limitations: increases in permitted maximum height up to 75 feet, except as provided in paragraph 3 below, with a site-wide average height not to exceed 50 feet, and except as further limited by the existing height limits in areas of an MUP site zoned C-W (Chapter 23E.64) and MU-R (Chapter 23E.84). Development in a MUP site is limited by the following:
   i. buildings shall be setback five (5) feet from any property line that abuts or confronts an MU-R zone not located within the MUP site;
   ii. in a MU-R zone within a MUP site buildings shall be no higher than 35 feet at the property line or setback line, whichever applies, and may increase to a maximum height of 45 feet provided they do not intersect a plane starting at 35 feet high and sloping on a 30 degree angle from horizontal inward toward the lot; and
   iii. in a MU-R zone within a MUP site any height granted using the density bonus provisions may not intersect the plane described in Section 23B.36.050.A.2.ii unless the applicant can demonstrate that adherence to this provision would be in violation of state law.

3. [Reserved];

4. Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Restrictions: increases in permitted maximum FAR of up to 3.0 except in the MU-R District, where FAR is limited by the MU-R District regulations. For purposes of this section, above grade parking structures count for lot coverage calculations but not for FAR calculations;

5. Setbacks: reduced setbacks from residential uses;

6. Spacing Requirements: use separation standards may be reduced;

7. Uses: Land Uses permitted by the underlying zoning of the land that comprises a Master Use Permit site may be located within the site without regard to the zoning district boundaries, subject to the thresholds and permit requirements of the Master Use Permit, except that:
   i. residential uses shall not be allowed in the M, MM or MU-LI portions of an MUP site,
   ii. residential density in the MU-R portion of an MUP site shall be calculated using the standards applicable in the C-W district, although the height limits for MU-R residential uses shall conform with Section 23B.36.050(A)(2) (ii), and flexibility regarding parking may be allowed pursuant to paragraph 1, above,
   iii. the following MU-LI uses are prohibited in MU-R portions of an MUP site: construction products manufacturing, pharmaceutical manufacturing, testing and commercial biological research laboratories, and commercial excavation, and
   iv. any research and development use that may be allowed in an MU-R portion of an MUP site is only allowed subject to the findings in Section 23B.36.090.E;

8. The replacement of Manufacturing, Warehouse, Wholesale, or Material-Recovery activities with Other Industrial uses permitted in any of the zoning districts in which the subject property is located.

9. The maximum lot coverage allowed for an MUP site is 75% and there must be a minimum of 10% publicly accessible open space, not including surface parking.

B. The Gross Floor Area allocated for each use may vary from that set forth in the Master Use Permit by up to ten percent (10%) with a Zoning Certificate, as long as the new use allocations meet all requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. Variations of more than ten percent (10%) but less than twenty-five percent (25%) from the stated Gross Floor Area for any use may be authorized by the Zoning Officer; variations of more than twenty-five percent (25%) may be authorized by the Board. Any such change shall still be subject to the requirements set forth in the approved MUP, including the finding required by Section 23B.32.040.A.

C. Notwithstanding the conversion requirements applicable in the underlying districts within an approved MUP, spaces within an MUP site may be divided, aggregated and/or converted in any manner, as a matter of right as long as such division, aggregation or conversion is consistent with the gross floor area limitations for uses and findings and requirements set forth in the MUP.

23B.36.060 Master Use Permit excludes other alterations of development standards
The flexibility provided under this Chapter to alter development standards is exclusive and supersedes all other provisions of this Title under which development standards may be altered, except as provided under Section 23B.44.050. In cases where this Chapter applies, Chapter 23B.48 shall not apply, and vice versa.

23B.36.070 Contents of Master Use Permit

In addition to the information and requirements that are normally contained in a Use Permit, as well as any specific additional conditions or requirements the Board may impose, a Master Use Permit shall include the number of square feet of buildings and land to be used for Industrial (Manufacturing, Wholesaling and Warehousing), Office (exclusive of offices ancillary to other uses), Commercial (Retail and Personal Service), Live/Work Units and Residential Uses and a detailed phasing plan as described in Section 23B.36.030.A.

23B.36.080 Vesting

A. An MUP shall be deemed to have been exercised in its entirety upon the substantial completion of the first phase thereof. Thereafter, it shall be considered to be vested in its entirety.

B. Failure to substantially comply with the detailed phasing plan contained in the MUP shall be a violation of the MUP and subject to revocation or modification per Chapter 23B.60.

23B.36.090 Findings

A. In order to approve a MUP, the Board must make both the finding required by Section 23B.32.040.A and the following additional findings:

1. The proposed project will be consistent with the purposes of this Chapter;

2. The proposed project includes the applicable requirements of the Mitigation Monitoring Program adopted concurrently with this Chapter; and

3. All new building within the proposed project must comply with the Bird-Safe Building Design Guidelines, as specified in SEIR Mitigation Measure BIO-1, to reduce the frequency of bird collisions in the area.

B. For alterations of development standards and permitted uses under Section 23B.36.050.A the Board must find that the proposed project would confer measurable community benefits that affirmatively advance the purposes of this Chapter or the West Berkeley Plan in accordance with the requirements adopted by the Council per Section 23B.36.040, and that the applicant has agreed to enter into a binding commitment to do so.

C. For alterations of Permitted Uses under Section 23B.36.050.A.7, the Board must find that the proposed project will maintain the overall industrial nature of the West Berkeley Area and the MUP site.

D. For variations in the gross floor area allocated for specific uses under subdivision C of Section 23B.36.050, the Zoning Officer or Board must find that any proposed variation is consistent with the purposes of this Chapter.

E. In order to approve a Master Use Permit that allows uses permissible in the M, MM, or MU-LI districts that are specifically prohibited in C-W or MUR districts to be located in the C-W or MU-R portions of the site, the Board must find that the proposed locations of those uses would not increase the incompatibility of uses, either within the site itself or between the site and surrounding area.

F. In order to approve a Master Use Permit that contains buildings within the MU-LI or within 100 feet of either MU-LI or MU-R districts, the Board must find that the project

1. would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of adjacent properties, especially on the scale and character of adjacent homes;

2. would provide appropriate transition to minimize changes in scale from existing development to higher scale and more intense development; and

3. would not cause an unreasonable shadow on any sensitive area.

G. In order to approve a Master Use Permit adjacent to the boundary of Aquatic Park, the Board must find that the project will not unreasonably create shadows upon degrade the existing visual quality or character of, or pedestrian access to Aquatic Park.

Section 4. Amendment of Measure

The amendments adopted by the voters in this measure may be repealed or amended by the City Council without a vote of the people as long as any such amendments do not increase the aggregate amount of development allowed by this measure.

Section 5. Effectiveness

A. Sections 2 and 3 of this measure shall not take effect until the Council adopts an ordinance that requires any development under Section 3 to provide at least one of the following community benefits:

1. Retain and provide affordable work space for artists or funds for that purpose.

2. Provide transportation demand management measures consistent with the West Berkeley Circulation Master Plan Report or funds for that purpose.

3. Provide access to and participation in jobs training programs designed to advance employment prospects for Berkeley residents, especially those living near or below the poverty line.

4. Provide affordable work force housing in West Berkeley or funds for that purpose.

5. Contribute to environmental improvements at Aquatic Park or other measures to improve environmental quality in West Berkeley.

6. Payment of prevailing wages for all construction work under the MUP.

7. Provision of privately owned but publicly accessible
open space as part of the MUP.

8. Provision of space and or support to childcare providers so that affordable childcare can be provided to those who need and qualify for it.

9. Require local sourcing of building materials to the extent feasible.

10. Provide benefits or raise funds for programs and initiatives that further goals of the West Berkeley Plan.

B. Sections 2 and 3 of this measure shall not take effect until the Council adopts an ordinance that adopts:

1. a formula for determining the value of community benefits that will be required;

2. a process under which applicants for master use permits under Section 3 are required to demonstrate meaningful attempts to meet and consult with the affected community prior to filing an application; and

3. mechanisms for ensuring that the affected community is involved in evaluation of the adequacy of any proposed community benefits, that community benefits inure primarily to the benefit of West Berkeley, and that there is community involvement in overseeing provision of promised community benefits.

C. No MUP may be approved for any site abutting, confronting or adjacent to Aquatic Park until the Council adopts an ordinance adopting measures to protect and where possible improves the environmental, recreational and aesthetic qualities of Aquatic Park. Such measures shall include, but are not limited to the following elements:

1. Height limitations;
2. Floor area ration (FAR) limitations;
3. Setbacks;
4. Controls on runoff and site drainage;
5. Mitigation measures to avoid or lessen shadowing of Aquatic Park; and
6. Protection of significant views of and from Aquatic Park.

Section 6. Severability.

If any section, sentence, clause, phrase, or portion of this Ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid or unenforceable by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining sections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or portions of this ordinance shall nonetheless remain in full force and effect. The people of the City of Berkeley hereby declare that they would have adopted each section, sentence, clause, phrase, or portion of this Ordinance, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or portions of this Ordinance be declared invalid or unenforceable and, to that end, the provisions of this Ordinance are severable.
Shall an ordinance be adopted: establishing new agenda and meeting requirements for the City’s legislative bodies (Council, Rent Stabilization Board and all 36 commissions), including earlier agenda deadlines; increased disclosure requirements for public records; and creating a new commission with authority to take enforcement action against the City in case of violations?  

Financial Implications: Uncertain; annual costs are estimated between $1,000,000 to $2,000,000 depending on level of enforcement by commission and number of Council meetings.

CITY ATTORNEY’S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE U

This ordinance would add new agenda, meeting and records requirements on the City Council, Rent Stabilization Board, Board of Library Trustees and all 35 other boards and commissions (“Legislative Bodies”), and create a new commission.

It could be amended only by the voters, except time limits for public comment could be modified by consent of the City Council and the new commission.

New Commission

It would create a new commission that would have authority to sue the City to enforce the ordinance and would require the City to provide staff and legal counsel to the commission at City expense, apparently outside the normal budget process.

Agenda Process

It would:

• change the agenda process for all Legislative Bodies to conform to the longer Council agenda process;
• require additional notice for special meetings;
• allow the public by petition to add items to agendas (100 signatures for Council and Rent Stabilization Board; 50 for commissions).

Meetings

It would:

• expand public comment to allow speakers three minutes on each item;
• require the parliamentarian to make a recommendation as to any matter during a meeting that is challenged by the public as being out of order;
• require additional public notification of meetings where certain types of actions are proposed;
• increase testimony at hearings in land use, zoning, building and landmarks appeals;
• require Legislative Bodies to change venues or cancel and reschedule meetings if the number of attendees exceeds the room’s capacity.

The ordinance would require all Legislative Bodies that conduct closed sessions to immediately report in open session all positions reached either by consensus or vote, the results of any vote, and then revote, even when disclosure is not otherwise required because no final action was taken.

Records

It would:

• define as “Lobbyists” all persons paid to influence City policy;
• require elected and appointed officials, Library Trustees, the City Manager and all department heads to post weekly calendars of all City-related meetings they attend, including by telephone;
• require disclosure of a greater range of documents, including some attorney-client communications; personnel records except as protected by state or federal law; staff drafts and memoranda; and contractor/vendor financial information;
• require conversion of City website and electronic information to formats accessible with open standards based software; and
• require the City to help persons requesting confidential information about third parties to request consent to disclosure of that information.

Material Effects

The ordinance would require the Council to meet more often, and may prevent or delay Council action on certain items due to the room capacity requirement noted above.

It would require disclosure of information that would adversely affect the City’s negotiating position in litigation settlements and possibly other matters.

Provisions granting the new commission authority to sue the City are inconsistent with Charter provisions granting sole authority over litigation to the Council.

City staff estimate the initial costs of compliance to be approximately $35,000, with annual costs between $1,000,000 and $2,000,000.

s/ZACH COWAN

Berkeley City Attorney
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE U

Vote Yes on Measure U, the Sunshine Ordinance

No matter what the issue, or your opinion, you deserve timely access to the same information available to elected officials and City staff, the opportunity to comment in open meetings before decisions are made, and prompt access to public records.

Why is Sunshine Needed?

• The State has defunded the key Brown Act requirement to give notice of public meetings.
• Too many times people wait for hours in overcrowded spaces before being allowed to speak for a minute or two on complex issues that differ from those previously announced, or they are locked out entirely and silenced. Too often reasonable requests for public records are denied.
• Enforcement is absent except through costly lawsuits and referenda.

Is Sunshine Enforcement Expensive?

Measure U provides for an Early Alert System to immediately correct sunshine violations, and a Commission process to fairly resolve disputes without costly lawsuits.

Will Sunshine Bring Berkeley to a Halt?

NO!

Measure U respects the public by allowing 3-minute public comment, requiring advance planning, ensuring an adequate sized meeting place, providing for equal time for all sides in land use public hearings, and a method to adjourn meetings by 11:00 pm. If the comment rule results in unreasonably longer meetings, the Measure provides a way to change it. Requiring advance planning for an adequate sized meeting place is common sense.

Is Sunshine Environmentally Friendly?

ABSOLUTELY!

Council packets are now printed form. Going paperless saves trees and reduces waste collection costs. City employees will no longer need to retrieve records from storage in Livermore.

Measure U saves money, helps the environment and ensures your inalienable right to know what your government is doing.

Vote Yes on Measure U, the Sunshine Ordinance. Everyone Needs It!

s/Shirley Dean
Former Mayor, City of Berkeley
s/Patrick Sheahan
Planning Commissioner, City of Berkeley
s/Martha Nicoloff
Author – Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance
s/Jacquelyn McCormick
Mayoral Candidate, Berkeley Council Watch, Berkeley Budget SOS
s/Dean Metzger
Chair Person – Berkeley Sunshine Committee, & Pass President of CENA

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE U

Measure U is NOT needed. Berkeley has always encouraged resident participation. Everyone already has access to the information that Measure U purports to provide. Berkeley has complied with the requirements of California’s Brown Act for decades and has gone further, mandating government transparency with our own 2011 Open Government Ordinance. Measure U adds nothing but layers of bureaucracy.

Is Measure U expensive? The City Manager’s cost estimate is $1 to 2 million per year – or more – depending on how much new litigation results because of Measure U. Given the city’s limited resources, how can we justify spending so much on unnecessary requirements that will waste staff time and inevitably delay the performance of essential day-to-day government service?

Will Measure U bring Berkeley to a Halt? Not to a halt. But, the many unreasonable requirements placed on public officials and staff will take time away from managing the City’s services, projects, and finances effectively and efficiently. The proposed Measure U Commission would exercise authority over all City employees, elected officials, and volunteer board members and commissioners, but would be accountable to no one.

Does Measure U make Berkeley more environmentally friendly? Berkeley has received national recognition for being at the forefront of environmental action. The City Clerk’s work plan already includes paperless Council packets in 2013. We don’t need Measure U to get us there.

Measure U is expensive, extreme, unnecessary and destructive.

Vote NO on Measure U.

s/Sherry Smith
President, League of Women Voters of Berkeley, Albany & Emeryville
s/Ann-Marie Hogan
City Auditor
s/Winston Burton
Chair Berkeley Board of Library Trustee
s/Karen Hemphill
Berkeley School Board Director
s/Loni Hancock
State Senator
ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE U

MEASURE U IS BAD FOR BERKELEY

Measure U would shift funds away from essential services at a time when budget shortfalls have already forced the City to make huge cuts. It would cost $1-2 million/year or more to comply with the new requirements and create a new commission with costly unlimited access to legal counsel (Section 1.30.440).

It would create a new Commission with unprecedented power and no accountability.

And the Measure is not necessary. Berkeley already has an Open Government Ordinance and commission with a similar purpose.

The new Commission would have unreasonable power, accountable to no one. It could:

- Remove and replace commissioners, normally a function of elected councilmembers. (1.30.400)
- Take court actions affecting city staff, boards and commissions. (1.30.480)
- Hire costly outside counsel – at taxpayer expense – and sue the City, councilmembers, volunteer commissioners, or staff, based on commission decisions, complaints, meetings procedures, or other requirements of the measure. (1.30.440; 1.30.480)

Gridlock would result from laborious new requirements to:

- Assign staff to comply with every citizen request, regardless of staff’s other duties or the urgency of the request. Under state law, cities may balance one person’s request with the broader community interest. (1.30.340)
- Provide written reports of all meetings – even one-on-one informal phone and email contacts – with any member of local, regional, or state bodies. (1.30.210)
- Allow anyone to place items on agendas of Berkeley’s boards/commissions with a small number of unverified signatures. (1.30.080 C)

Creating mountains of paperwork, a maze of requirements, and a commission with unprecedented powers is no way to improve government responsiveness. These provisions – creating so much unproductive work – would waste resources and compromise essential service delivery.

No other city has such extreme and expensive provisions. SAY “NO” TO MEASURE U.

s/Loni Hancock
State Senator
s/Linda Maio
Vice Mayor
s/Weldon Rucker
Former City Manager
s/Ann-Marie Hogan
City Auditor
s/Sherry Smith
President, League of Women Voters of Berkeley, Albany & Emeryville

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE U

DON'T FALL FOR THEIR FEAR OF CHANGE
YES ON MEASURE U

Would you trust a banker to write banking regulations? Claiming that the existing ordinance makes Sunshine unnecessary does just that. Sunlight is the only antidote to secrecy.

Myth: It’s unnecessary. “Berkeley already has an Open Government Ordinance.”
Fact: There is no enforcement under the existing ordinance to hold City officials accountable for violating citizens’ rights.

Myth: “U” takes money from essential services.
Fact: Freedom of information is an essential service. Projected costs are inflated and do not account for the costs of the existing ordinance, or the savings from putting records online.

Myth: Moving meetings to appropriately-sized venues disrupts the City.
Fact: “U” requires advance planning so that citizens won’t be locked out and silenced.

Myth: “No other city has such extreme and expensive provisions.”
Fact: Making existing open government laws enforceable, “U” will be the strongest ordinance of its kind.

Myth: “U” will lead to costly court battles.
Fact: The Sunshine Ordinance has checks and balances to prevent lawsuits.

Myth: Responding to “every citizen request” for public information is an unfair burden.
Fact: California law already requires that every citizen’s request be answered. “U” requires an explanation for withholding records.

Myth: Everyone will have to write reports even for informal contacts.
Fact: Reports are only required for meetings at which someone is officially representing Berkeley.

Measure U removes the maze that citizens face obtaining information, guarantees rights at public meetings and eliminates paper.

“YES” ON U
www.berkeleysunshine.org

s/Ronald Yee
MBA-Tax, Certified Public Accountant
s/Adolfo Cabral
Candidate for City Council District 2
s/Shannon R. Brown
Retired University Administrator
s/Beverly Doane
Treasurer, Claremont-Elmwood Neighborhood Assn.

s/Dean Metzger
Chair Person – Berkeley Sunshine Committee
FULL TEXT OF MEASURE U

Introduction

Section 1.30.010 Title of Chapter.

This Chapter of the Berkeley Municipal Code shall be known as the Berkeley Sunshine Ordinance.

Section 1.30.020 Findings.

A. Democracy in our representative form of government requires thoughtful and meaningful public participation. To fulfill this requirement, the people must have timely access to the same information on issues as is available to our elected officials and City staff, the opportunity to comment in open meetings on these issues before decisions are made, and prompt access to all public records.

B. Because these requirements are not currently being met, a deficit of trust in government has occurred and is growing. State laws like the Brown Act and California Public Records Act help, but do not go far enough. Too many requests for public records are denied. Not enough time is given to the public and decision-makers to read and understand essential reports and testimony regarding issues. Inadequate information leads to escalating misunderstandings and a lack of civility in interactions between City staff, elected and appointed officials, and the public. Important actions are announced rather than arrived at in open meetings. The public has been denied access to open meetings too many times. Speaking rules at meetings constantly change. Important regional government decisions that greatly affect the quality of life and economic well-being of our residents and businesses are made without their knowledge.

C. Despite requests, our City government has not demonstrated interest in finding solutions that will correct these problems. Today, the only redress available to people is through expensive private lawsuits or referenda that are wasteful and costly for both City and citizens.

D. We have the opportunity to lessen environmental impacts by reducing the mounting use of paper while also reducing operating expenses through greater reliance on electronic systems. In today’s atmosphere of rapidly changing technology we are in urgent need of a careful guide into a future that ensures governmental transparency and provides more and quicker access to information at significantly less expense.

Section 1.30.030 Purpose.

The purpose of this Chapter is to codify the City’s policy regarding public participation in the deliberations of the City’s Legislative Bodies, to ensure public access to Public Records, to declare the intent to expand such participation and access beyond that required by current City law and practice and to the maximum extent permitted by State and Federal law, and to establish a mechanism for the enforcement of the rights set forth in this Ordinance.

Section 1.30.040 Applicability.

The provisions of this Ordinance supersede other Berkeley ordinances that address the same issues to the extent they are inconsistent with this Ordinance.

Section 1.30.050 Definitions.

The words and phrases defined in this Section shall, for the purpose of this Ordinance, have the meanings specified below.

A. “Agenda” means a document that informs the public about a Meeting, published in advance of the Meeting which at a minimum (1) identifies the Legislative Body conducting the Meeting, (2) specifies the time and location of the Meeting, (3) lists each item of business to be discussed or transacted and describes the proposed action for each such item, and (4) lists all relevant Supporting Documents for each such item.

B. “Agenda Packet” means the Agenda of a particular Meeting with all its relevant Supporting Documents.

C. “City” means the City of Berkeley, California.

D. “City Council” means all members of the principal Legislative Body of the City as described in the City’s Charter.

E. “Closed Session” means a Meeting that begins with a public comment period, followed by a session that excludes the public under the requirements of State and Federal law, and ends with an open session at which a public report is made regarding that part of the Meeting that excluded the public.

F. “Commission” means the Sunshine Commission established in Section 1.30.380.

G. “Community Newspaper” means a newspaper that is published at least forty-five (45) times per year, distributes at least ten thousand (10,000) copies of each issue in the City of Berkeley, and devotes at least fifty (50) percent of its news coverage to Berkeley issues on a regular basis. If no newspaper meeting this definition exists, the Sunshine Commission shall determine what constitutes a Community Newspaper.

H. “The Custodian of Records” means the City Manager.

I. “A Custodian of Records” means a person or persons appointed or approved by the City Manager to be in charge of the records of any department or other entity subject to this Ordinance.

J. “Deadline” means the time and/or date by which an action is required to be completed. Unless otherwise specified, the time period allowed for an action shall be computed in calendar days. When computing a Deadline forward from a Meeting or other event, the first day counted shall be the day after the Meeting or event, and if City offices are closed on the last day counted, the following work day shall be the Deadline. When computing a Deadline backward from a Meeting or other event, the first day counted shall be the day before the Meeting or event, and if City offices are closed on the last day counted, the preceding work day shall be the Deadline.

K. “Legislative Body” means any of the following: All governing bodies of the City, including but not limited to, the City Council, Rent Stabilization Board, Library Board of Trustees, Redevelopment Agency, Housing Authority, and all City commissions, committees, and boards including private corporations or entities such as the Energy Services Corporation or similar bodies, or other bodies as...
defined in California Government Code Section 54950 - 54960 and its successor Sections.

L. “Legislative Committee or Subcommittees” means a temporary, informal committee or subcommittee of less than a Quorum of members of the Legislative Body, which meet at least two times with members of other Legislative Bodies and/or Staff about a particular issue for the express purpose of formulating recommendations regarding that issue to the Legislative Body.

M. “Lobbyist” means a person or entity that receives compensation for influencing legislative or administrative action or that compensates its employees or members for their lobbying activities.

1. “City Lobbyist” means a person or entity that is designated to represent the City before any person, office, Legislative Body, or other entity.

2. “Special Interest Lobbyist” means a person or entity that is paid by and represents any non-City agency, organization, or entity seeking to influence City policy.

N. “Meeting” means a gathering of a Quorum or more of the members of a Legislative Body at a specified time and place, including by teleconferencing or other technology, to hear, discuss, deliberate, or act on any matter that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Legislative Body, as defined in California Government Code Section 54950—54563 as of the effective date of this Ordinance and their successor Sections.

O. “Minor Correction” means a correction that consists only of a change in spelling or grammar with no significant change in meaning.

P. “Public Records” means any writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public’s business regardless of its physical form or characteristics, which is prepared, owned, used, or retained by any State or local agency.

Q. “Quorum” means a majority of the total authorized membership of a Legislative Body, but may be more than a majority if expressly required by this or another ordinance.

R. “Staff” means the City Manager, department heads, employees of all entities in the City Charter, directors and employees of Legislative Bodies, employees and volunteers in the offices of elected officials, and contractors.

S. “Supporting Documents” means all Public Records, regardless of form or medium or author, which are provided to members of a Legislative Body for their use in considering Agenda items for a particular Meeting, along with all communications that have been timely received for that Meeting.

Meetings

Section 1.30.060 Meetings to be Open.

A. All Meetings of Legislative Bodies and Legislative Committees and Subcommittees shall be open and public, except as required in Section 1.30.180 regarding Closed Sessions or by applicable State or Federal law. No payment shall be required from those desiring to attend a Meeting.

B. No decision shall be made by a Legislative Body in other than open and noticed Meetings, except as specified by State or Federal law. Any use of direct communication, personal intermediaries, or technological devices that is employed by a Quorum of a Legislative Body to develop a collective concurrence as to action to be taken on an item by the members of that Legislative Body is prohibited. No Staff member or member of a Legislative Body shall lobby or privately brief a majority of the members of that same Legislative Body, either as a whole or serially, to propose, oppose, or otherwise discuss any recommendation or Agenda item pending or to be submitted to such Legislative Body.

C. To ensure that business is conducted in the open, Legislative Bodies shall meet continuously during discussion of each Agenda item, except as shall be necessary for the person retained to provide captioning services for the Meeting.

D. When an item is continued to a future Meeting of a Legislative Body, each member of the body shall, at that subsequent Meeting, disclose the content of any intervening conversations with other members of the body, Lobbyists, and Staff pertaining to the held-over item that took place during the continuance, and as provided for in 1.30.170.

Section 1.30.070 Time, Place, and Frequency of Meetings.

A. Each Legislative Body shall establish a time for regular Meetings when a significant portion of the public is able to attend. Meetings shall be held in a place that is of sufficient size for those attending, is accessible for the physically disabled, provides for adequate amplification, and where possible, has video transmission capability, audio, and video-streaming.

B. All Meetings shall be held in the City of Berkeley, unless the City Council finds, in advance of a Meeting, that the City’s interest is likely to suffer if the Meeting is held within the city limits.

C. If a Meeting is likely to be attended by a large number of members of the public, the Agenda scheduling process for each Legislative Body shall provide for holding the Meeting in a venue large enough to accommodate the numbers anticipated to attend and that meets the requirements of this Section.

D. Where a Legislative Body determines that the regular Meeting location does not meet the requirements of Subsection A above, the Legislative Body shall, by its own motion, either cancel or change the location of the Meeting provided that prominent and timely notices are posted at the original site.

E. A meal or other gathering of a Quorum of a Legislative Body immediately before or during a Meeting of the Legislative Body is part of that Meeting and the public shall be permitted to hear and observe the gathering.

F. A sufficient number of regular_Meetings of Legislative Bodies shall be held throughout the calendar year to ensure the City’s business is completed in a public and timely manner in accordance with the provisions of this Ordinance.
Section 1.30.080 Submitting Items for the Regular Meeting Agendas.

A. Each Legislative Body shall establish a process for placing items, including presentations, on its own regular Meeting Agendas and designate a contact person responsible for receiving proposed Agenda items and Supporting Documents. Applicable procedures shall appear on the City’s website and on each Agenda.

B. Any procedure for setting the Agenda by a Legislative Body shall provide for public participation with timely notice in compliance with this Ordinance.

C. With the exception of appeals from a quasi-judicial decision, any member of the public may place an item under the purview of a Legislative Body on the Agenda of that body by presenting the item to the designated Agenda contact person, with one hundred (100) or more signatures of Berkeley residents for an elected Legislative Body or fifty (50) or more signatures of Berkeley residents for a non-elected Legislative Body. Items submitted by the public shall be placed on the Action Calendar and cannot be moved to the Consent Calendar. Once such an item has been acted upon by the Legislative Body, subsequent items that are substantially the same may not be submitted for a period of one year, except on a showing of significantly changed circumstances.

D. All proposed Agenda items submitted in accordance with the Deadlines specified in Subsection E below shall appear on a regular Agenda of the Legislative Body that takes into consideration the timeliness of the item.

E. Deadlines for submission of Agenda items and related Supporting Documents for regular Meetings of Legislative Bodies shall be as follows:

1. Except for old business and citizens’ petitions for recalls, initiatives, and referenda that have been certified as having qualified for the ballot, all items to be considered for placement on the regular Meeting Agenda of a Legislative Body shall be furnished to the Agenda contact person no later than 12:00 noon, twenty (20) or more days prior to the Meeting for which the items shall appear on the Agenda.

2. Information regarding all items submitted for an Agenda shall be available to the public no later than 5:00 PM, twenty (20) or more days prior to the Meeting for which the items shall appear on the Agenda. This information shall be in the form of a list that includes the sponsor’s name, title, and proposed action for each item. The information shall be posted on the City’s website and placed in written form in the office of the Agenda contact person and shall include the date, time, and place of any Meeting at which the draft Agenda will be discussed and the final Agenda determined.

3. All Supporting Documents for Agenda items shall be submitted to the Agenda contact person no later than noon, fifteen (15) days prior to the Meeting for which the items shall appear on the Agenda.

4. The Agenda contact person shall not accept any new or revised item or revised Supporting Document for inclusion on the Agenda of a regular Meeting after the established Deadline.

5. Draft Agendas shall be finalized by noon, twelve (12) days prior to a Meeting.

Section 1.30.090 Agenda Content

A. Every Agenda shall contain statements regarding disability-related accommodations and a statement regarding the right of all persons to address the Legislative Body or Committee/Subcommittee in accordance with the requirements of this Ordinance.

B. Agenda items shall be written in easily understood language without undefined abbreviations or acronyms and should at a minimum provide the following information: an accurate description of the subject matter, recommended action, fiscal impact, the website, and other locations at which Supporting Documents and related documents can be found, and contact information.

C. When items are withdrawn from the Agenda of a Legislative Body before publication of the final Agenda, the Agenda shall state the reason for withdrawal. Notice of such withdrawals shall also be posted on the City’s website as soon as possible.

Section 1.30.100 Documents Submitted by Members of the Public, Addressed to a Member or Members of a Legislative Body or to the Secretary of the Legislative Body for Distribution.

A. Documents that are received at least twelve (12) days before a regular Meeting shall be included in the Agenda Packet to be issued eleven (11) days in advance of the Meeting and shall be posted as described in Section 1.30.260.

B. Documents received after the twelfth (12th) day and through the fifth (5th) day prior to a regular Meeting shall be included in Supplemental Agenda Communications Packet #1, placed in a viewing binder available to the public, and made available as described in Section 1.30.260.

C. Documents received after the fifth (5th) day and prior to 12:00 noon on the day of the regular Meeting shall be included in Supplemental. Agenda Communications Packet #2 which shall promptly be posted on the City’s website and made available to the public in the appropriate department office. Copies shall be available at the Meeting.

D. Documents received after 12:00 noon on the day of the regular Meeting, including during the Meeting, shall be included in Supplemental Agenda Communications Packet #3. When a document is submitted by a member of the public at the Meeting, it shall be distributed to members of the Legislative Body immediately upon submission, if thirty (30) copies have been provided: twenty (20) for the Legislative Body and Staff, plus ten (10) copies for the public. If fewer than thirty (30) copies have been provided, the document shall be placed in Communication Packet #3. All such documents shall be available for review by members of the public by 3:00 PM, two (2) business days
following the Meeting.

**Section 1.30.110 Draft Agendas for Regular Meetings of Legislative Bodies.**

A. On the fourteenth (14th) day prior to the regular Meeting, the Agenda contact person shall post a draft Agenda for that Meeting, as described in Section 1.30.260.

B. The draft Agenda for a regular Meeting shall contain a prominent notification that the Agenda is subject to change up until noon of the twelfth (12th) day prior to the subject Meeting.

C. The Agenda contact person shall maintain a record indicating the location, date, and time of posting of each draft Agenda.

**Section 1.30.120 Final Agendas for Regular Meetings of Legislative Bodies/Legislative Committees or Subcommittees.**

A. On the eleventh (11th) day prior to the Meeting of a Legislative Body to which it applies, the final Agenda and links to obtain Supporting Documents in the Agenda Packet shall be posted as described in Section 1.20.260.

B. Seventy-two (72) hours prior to the meeting to which it applies, the Agenda of a Legislative Committee or Subcommittee shall be posted as described in Section 1.30.260.

C. Each Agenda contact person shall maintain a record indicating the location, date, and time of such posting.

**Section 1.30.130 Distribution of Final Agendas and Agenda Packets for Regular Meetings of Legislative Bodies.**

No later than eleven (11) days prior to a regular Meeting, the Agenda contact person shall distribute the Agenda Packet to each member of the Legislative Body, and if requested, to members of the press. A copy shall also be placed in a viewing binder in the office of the Agenda contact person and in each Berkeley public library. Copies of the Agenda shall be mailed to any person who has requested it in writing.

**Section 1.30.140 Action Requirements for Legislative Bodies.**

A. No ordinance, resolution, or motion of a Legislative Body shall be deemed approved without receiving at least the number of affirmative votes equal to that of a Quorum for that body, except as may be specified by other provisions of this Ordinance.

B. No discussion or action by the Legislative Body shall be taken on any item not appearing on the Agenda. However, the Legislative Body may refer such a matter to staff or request that the matter be placed on a subsequent Agenda.

C. No Agenda item shall be considered at the Meeting if the item’s Supporting Documents are not included in an Agenda Packet that is timely received in accord with Section 1.30.100.

D. With the exception of Minor Corrections, no change to Agenda items or their Supporting Documents may be made once the final Agenda has been published as specified above.

E. Staff may not make oral reports to Legislative Bodies in lieu of written reports, but shall be available at Meetings to answer questions.

**Section 1.30.150 Legislative Body Meeting Agenda Sequence.**

A. Each Legislative Body shall set its own Meeting Agenda sequence of business. This sequence may be amended from time to time by a majority vote of the body after holding a noticed public hearing.

B. However amended, the Meeting Agenda Sequence for every Legislative Body must always satisfy the following:

1. Public comment on each Agenda item and Non-Agenda items shall be as set forth in this Ordinance. At regular Meetings, public comment on Non-Agenda items by up to ten (10) speakers shall occur at the beginning of the Meeting with priority given to individuals with disabilities and special needs, the elderly, and those accompanied by small children. Additional speakers wishing to speak on Non-Agenda items shall be accommodated during the latter part of the Agenda under the same protocol.

2. Ceremonial matters, if any, shall be limited to a maximum of fifteen (15) minutes.

3. Reports on meetings of regional bodies and other agencies as described Section 1.30.210 if any, shall be placed on the Agenda as information items where they are subject to public comment and movement to action for discussion at the request of a single member of the Legislative Body.

4. Decisions regarding appeals, if any, shall not be placed on the Consent Calendar.

C. The order of individual Agenda items shall not be changed during the Meeting, except by a majority vote of the Legislative Body, before which members shall state their reasons for the record.

D. It is the intent of this provision that all Agenda items be completed prior to 11:00 PM. At approximately 10:00 PM, the Legislative Body shall assess what Agenda items shall be completed prior to 11:00 PM. The Legislative Body shall adjourn until public comment on Non-Agenda items has been completed.

**Section 1.30.160 Public Speech Rights During Meetings.**

A. At the beginning of each Meeting of a Legislative Body, the presiding officer shall inform the public that their rights under this Section are posted on the Agenda and at the entrance of the Meeting room.

B. Any person attending a Meeting of a Legislative Body shall be provided an opportunity to speak for three
(3) minutes on each Agenda item prior to any action by the body and in the case of a regular Meeting for two (2) minutes on a Non-Agenda item. Up to four (4) speakers on Agenda or Non-Agenda items may combine their time when each of such speakers is present at the Meeting. The provision for public speaking times in this Section may be amended by an affirmative, unanimous vote of the membership of the Sunshine Commission and an affirmative, unanimous vote of the membership of the City Council following a public hearing on the subject.

C. Any person attending a meeting of a Legislative Committee/Subcommittee shall be provided an opportunity to speak for a time as determined by the members of the Legislative Committee/Subcommittee.

D. Legislative Bodies shall not prohibit orderly public criticism of the body either by verbal comment or by holding signs.

E. Speakers have the right to use presentation tools, which shall be provided by the City, if available, and when requested five (5) business days in advance of a Meeting date.

F. The public has the right to alert a Legislative Body or a Legislative Committee/Subcommittee about a violation of this Ordinance or other procedural regulations by the following means:

1. At any time up to and including during the Meeting of a Legislative Body, if a matter is considered to be a violation of this Ordinance or the Legislative Body’s procedural requirements, a member of the public may submit a complaint to the secretary of the Legislative Body on a Sunshine Alert form developed by the Commission.
   a. If the Alert is received before the Meeting, the secretary shall transmit the Alert form to appropriate Staff who shall inform members of the body in question.
   b. If the Alert is received during the Meeting, the secretary shall submit the Alert to Staff designated to act as Parliamentarian. The Parliamentarian shall announce the substance of the Alert when the item in question is before the body and his/her recommendation as to what action, if any, should be taken.
   c. The Alert and the action which followed shall be reported to the Commission.

2. Alerts received either before or during a meeting of a Legislative Committee/Subcommittee shall be submitted directly to the Commission with a request for their recommendation as to how to proceed.

3. The Commission shall prepare a follow-up report on each Alert received and place it on the Agenda for the next Meeting of the appropriate body that satisfies the requirements of Section 1.30.080.

Section 1.30.170 Procedures for Public Hearings.

A. For all public hearings, Staff shall introduce the public hearing by briefly summarizing their submitted report.
4. After all public comment has been received, one (1) person representing the applicant, one (1) person representing each appellant (when different from the applicant), and one (1) person representing each, real party in interest are entitled to sit with Staff at the Staff table with opportunity to answer questions and respond to comments made by members of the Staff or the Council.

F. After hearing testimony and public comment, the Legislative Body may close a public hearing or continue it to another specified date. Action following the close of a public hearing shall take place at the next Meeting of the Legislative Body to allow members of the Legislative Body time to consider the testimony and any new information received at the hearing. If it is legally required to take action at the same Meeting following the receipt of testimony, the Legislative Body shall state the reason for doing so before acting upon the subject of the public hearing.

Section 1.30.180 Closed Sessions.

A Legislative Body shall only meet in Closed Session when doing so is specified by State or Federal law. The procedures for Closed Session shall be as follows:

A. Before any Closed Session, a Legislative Body shall meet in open session for the purpose of taking public comment solely on the subject(s) of the Closed Session.

B. Any member of a Legislative Body attending a Closed Session by teleconferencing is required to state at the beginning and end of the Closed Session that he/she is participating with no other person present and to file a signed statement to that effect under penalty of perjury, except that for the following circumstances. If a member of a Legislative Body is disabled and needs assistance to participate in a Closed Session, the City shall provide a Staff assistant who is authorized to attend the Closed Session. Additionally, any specialized attendant or assistant, whom a disabled Council Member needs to have present in order to participate fully in the Closed Session shall be allowed to attend the Closed Session.

C. For Closed Sessions on litigation matters, the Agenda shall list the parties involved, the actions being considered, and court case numbers, if assigned.

D. For Closed Sessions on real property negotiations, the Agenda shall identify the property by address, parcel number, and proposed purpose. Disclosure of the source(s) of payment for the property must be specified when negotiations are complete.

E. All Closed Sessions of any Legislative Body shall be audio recorded in their entirety and made a part of a record of the Meeting. Closed Session tapes shall be archived in the custody of the City Attorney. These recordings and any other records of the Closed Session shall be made available whenever all rationales for keeping the records confidential are no longer applicable.

1. Recordings of Closed Sessions of a Legislative Body convened due to anticipated legislation shall be released to the public under any of the following circumstances:
   a. Two years after the Meeting if no litigation is filed.
   b. Upon expiration of the statute of limitations for the anticipated litigation if no litigation is filed.
   c. As soon as the controversy leading to anticipated litigation is settled or concluded.

F. All agreements for the purchase or sale of real estate, contracts with employees, and agreements with other Legislative Bodies and regional agencies discussed in Closed Session shall not be deemed approved until the vote is taken in an open Meeting. Agreements between the City and other entities regarding land use and transportation issues that have been discussed in Closed Session shall not be deemed approved or rejected until a public hearing has been held and a vote is taken following the hearing. Such items shall be placed on the Agenda of a subsequent regular Meeting in the same manner that any new item is placed on the Agenda of the Legislative Body.

G. Immediately following the end of the Closed Session, the Legislative Body shall make a report in open session describing all matters reached either by consensus or voted upon and the results of such votes, whether approved or not. This shall be followed by a re-vote in full view of the public.

H. The location of reports to the public after a Closed Session has ended shall be in a venue that is open to the public, and where possible, one that supports video transmission, audio, and video-streaming. The report on Closed Session actions shall be posted no later than the end of the following business day to the City’s website and to all other places where the Agenda of the Legislative Body in question is posted.

Section 1.30.190 Special Meetings.

A. A presiding officer or three (3) members of a Legislative Body may call a Special Meeting with four (4) calendar days notice, but only for the purpose of considering a single item based on information that has come to light after the Agenda deadline for the last regular Meeting of the Legislative Body, which requires action prior to the next regular Meeting of the Legislative Body and which will do irreparable harm to the City if action is not taken before the next regular Meeting.

B. The reason and timing for the Special Meeting shall be printed on the Agenda for the Special Meeting. The Agenda along with its Supporting Documents shall be posted and available to the public, as provided for Section 1.30.260 no later than seventy-two (72) hours in advance of the Special Meeting.

C. At the beginning of the Special Meeting, after public comment is received, the Legislative Body shall vote on whether to proceed with the Special Meeting. The Special Meeting shall proceed only if two thirds (2/3) or more of the members are present and a Quorum of the Legislative Body votes affirmatively to proceed. Lacking the vote to proceed, the item on the Agenda will be deferred to the next regular Meeting that satisfies the requirements in Section 1.30.080.

Section 1.30.200 Emergency and Dire Emergency
Meetings.

State law defines the circumstances and procedures for noticing and holding two (2) levels of emergency meetings: an Emergency Meeting and a Dire Emergency Meeting. At the beginning of either an Emergency or a Dire Emergency Meeting, a majority of attending members of the City Council shall confirm the nature of the emergency or dire emergency and the business which is to be transacted. The circumstances under which such meetings may be held and the procedures for holding Emergency and Dire Emergency Meetings in the City shall be at a minimum those that were in effect under State law as of the effective date of this Ordinance.

Section 1.30.210 Reporting Requirements for Meetings of Local, Regional, State, and National Agencies, Institutions, and Other Entities.

A. When one or more persons acting as a representative of the City or any of its Legislative Bodies, attends a meeting in person or by use of technology at which an item affecting the City is discussed with another representative of or members of local, regional, state or national agencies, including but not limited to, Legislative Bodies, the University of California, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, the University of California Board of Regents, and other institutions and entities, such representative shall, within five (5) business days following the meeting, provide a written report to be placed on the Agenda of the appropriate Legislative Body or Bodies. The report shall state the name of the person or group, the time, place, and purpose of the meeting, a summary of the discussion of any item that impacts the City, the positions expressed by the Berkeley representative, any action(s) or non-action(s) taken, and the vote(s), if any, of the Berkeley representative.

B. Within six (6) months after the enactment of this Ordinance, Staff, working in consultation with the Commission, shall include on the City’s website, up-to-date, organized information on the ongoing activities of regional bodies and the University of California, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, and the University of California Board of Regents, including website links to these agencies, their agendas and minutes, the City representatives’ meeting reports, and information about activities of those entities that may be of significant interest to the residents of Berkeley.

Section 1.30.220 Audio or Video Recording and Broadcast of Meetings.

A. All Legislative Bodies shall record their Meetings with an audio recorder. Such recordings shall be permanently retained, be archived on the City’s website and available to the public.

B. All regular and Special Meetings of the City Council, Redevelopment Agency, Rent Stabilization Board, and Zoning Adjustments Board held in the venue regularly used shall be audio recorded, televised and video-streamed live and archived for replay on the local government cable channel and on the Internet. Such web broadcasts shall be captioned with the captioned text displayed on the cable broadcast and as part of the video-stream. The captioner’s transcript of the Meeting shall be retained with the video recording.

C. The City shall annually make a good faith effort to add Meetings of the Planning Commission, Board of Library Trustees, Housing Authority, Landmarks Preservation Commission, and Housing Advisory and Appeals Board to those Meetings that are televised and video-streamed.

D. The requirement to cable broadcast and video-stream Meetings shall not apply if necessary equipment malfunctions or if a public Meeting is changed to a location that does not have the technological capacity to accommodate the cable, web broadcast, and captioning. However, an audio recording of the Meeting shall be made, and a written transcript shall be produced.

E. Any person attending a Meeting of a Legislative Body may record the proceedings with an audio, video recorder, a still or motion picture camera, or broadcast the proceedings; unless or until the body makes a finding that the recording creates an unreasonable and persistent disruption of the proceedings.

Section 1.30.230 Meeting Minutes.

A. For Legislative Bodies, the secretary of that body shall prepare the minutes of each Meeting. The minutes shall state the date and place of the Meeting, the time the Meeting was called to order, the names of the members present at the time the Meeting was called to order, the names and times of arrival or departure of any member of the Legislative Body arriving or leaving the Meeting after the call to order and before adjournment, the names of presenters and Staff who provided reports or comments, the names of other persons attending any Closed Session, Closed Session announcements, disclosures of any conflicts of interest and ex parte communications, a list of those members of the public who spoke on each matter (and their names, if the speakers identified themselves) a brief summary of each person’s statement during the public comment period, the vote by name of each member on each matter considered by the body at the Meeting, and the time the Meeting was adjourned.

B. No later than six (6) business days after a Meeting draft minutes of a Meeting of a Legislative Body shall be posted on the City’s website and be available for inspection and copying upon request. The minutes of a Meeting shall be officially adopted within sixty (60) days and available to the public no later than six (6) business days after the Meeting at which they are adopted.

C. For Legislative Committees/Subcommittees, a member or Staff, as designated, shall prepare minutes of each meeting. The minutes shall state the date, time, and place of the meeting, the names of all those present, a brief description of the discussion, and any action taken. Minutes shall be prepared for adoption at the next subsequent meeting, posted on the City’s website and made available to the public in the office of the contact person of the appropriate Legislative Body.

Access to Public Information

For the purposes of this Ordinance, California
Section 1.30.240 Responsibilities of Staff.

A. In addition to the duties assigned in other Sections of this Ordinance, whenever the City Manager issues an Annual Report on the City, such Report shall contain information on the rights of residents under this Ordinance, how those rights may be exercised, a summary of complaints filed under the Ordinance, and the results of any complaints. Further, the City Manager shall ensure that Staff is trained regarding their obligations under this Ordinance. The City Manager (herein referred to as The Custodian of Records) shall also designate in each department/office a departmental Custodian of Records (herein referred to as A Custodian of Records), who shall ensure that all Staff who have contact with the public are prepared to provide written and oral information to the public.

B. A Custodian of Records shall, during normal hours of operation, without unreasonable delay, and without requiring an appointment, permit any person to inspect Public Record(s).

C. A Custodian of Records shall, as soon as possible and within ten (10) days following receipt of a request for a Public Record, comply with such request. If A Custodian of Records believes the record requested is not a Public Record, he/she shall state in writing the express provisions of law that justify withholding the record.

D. When a member of the public submits a written request for information to any paid or elected agent of the City, that agent shall respond to said request within two (2) business days by providing the information or explaining how, when, and by whom the information will be provided, and who shall then have the responsibility of responding within ten (10) days of receipt of such referral.

E. Nothing in this Section shall be interpreted to hinder ordinary assistance in supplying records or information to the public and informal communication between members of the public, Staff, and members of Legislative Bodies.

Section 1.30.250 Responsibilities of the Mayor.

If the Mayor delivers a State of the City address, it shall be given in a disabled accessible venue with audio and video-streaming and transmission capabilities. The event shall be noticed, recorded, free to the public and open to all. The address shall include a report on the previous year’s Sunshine complaints, how they were resolved, and a summary of any actions taken or pending related to provisions of this Ordinance.

Section 1.30.260 Notices and Posting of Information.

A. At a minimum, the following shall be posted on the City’s website and provided in written form in the City Clerk’s Office and at the reference desk of each Berkeley public library:

City Charter
Berkeley Municipal Code

Building Code
General Plan and Area Plans
Zoning Ordinance
Landmarks Preservation Ordinance
Sunshine Ordinance
Citizen’s Guide to Public Information
Records Index
Records Retention Schedule
Council Rules of Procedure (when revised to comply with this Ordinance)
Commissioner’s Manual (when revised to comply with this Ordinance)
Conflict of Interest Code
Statements of Economic Interest
Appointment Calendars
Agendas and Minutes of the Meetings of all Legislative Bodies

B. Each Legislative Body shall designate one or more physical locations to post notices. Designated posting locations shall be freely accessible to members of the public twenty-four (24) hours per day, visually prominent, and readable from the public right of way. Notices and Agendas shall be posted indicating links as to where Supporting Documents and other Agenda related documents may be found on the City’s website. In addition, such documents shall be placed in each Berkeley public library.

C. At a minimum, within six (6) months after enactment of this Ordinance, each Legislative Body shall have posted on the City’s website all current Meeting Agendas, minutes, and other documents required to be made public and thereafter, make reasonable efforts to post past materials. Each Legislative Body shall make reasonable efforts to ensure that its portion of the City’s website is updated on at least a weekly basis.

D. Large documents, such as drafts and final copies of City budgets and records concerning environmental impacts, including but not limited to, those resulting from compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA), shall be posted on the City’s website and made available at designated City offices with copies available for borrowing by the public at each Berkeley public library.

E. Notices shall be written in easily understood language without undefined abbreviations or acronyms and give a full description of the subject, applicable regulations, significant consequences of taking action or non-action, when and where the subject will be considered, opportunities for public comment, and where to obtain further information.

F. The Commission shall review public notices to ensure that they conform to the requirements of this Ordinance and work to improve publicly accessible information databases to ensure consistency, equity, timing, and extent of noticing for Meetings and other matters of public interest.

G. Right to notice regarding matters that may impact the physical environment shall be equivalent for residen-
tial and commercial tenants and property owners.

H. Meetings on matters related to or actions taken in anticipation of a potential development project or other land use matter, such as but not limited to grant applications, project funding, and ordinance changes, including but not limited to, General Plan and area plan amendments or rights transfers, shall be noticed at least as extensively as is required for Meetings on said projects.

Section 1.30.270 Public Records Index.

A. The City shall maintain a Public Records Index that identifies types of records maintained by departments and offices, including those of elected officials and Legislative Bodies. The Index shall be available to the public and organized under a uniform reference system that permits a general understanding of the types of records maintained, in which offices and departments, and for what periods of retention. The Index shall be sufficient to aid the public in making a focused inquiry regarding Public Records. The Index shall be posted on the City’s website and available in written form in the City Clerk’s office and in each Berkeley public library.

B. The Index shall classify each type of record as either: (1) “Open,” meaning accessible to the public without exception and subject to immediate disclosure; or (2) “Partially Open,” meaning possibly containing some exempt content, such that: review is required; or (3) “Closed,” meaning that disclosure of the document is prohibited by State or Federal law. Each classification of a record as “Partially Open” or “Closed” shall identify the specific legal authority relied upon in assigning that classification.

C. The Custodian of Records shall be responsible for preparing and maintaining the Index. He/she shall report on the progress of developing the Index to the Commission on at least a quarterly basis until it is completed, which shall be no later than twelve (12) months from the enactment of this Ordinance. In identifying the types of records to be maintained, each department, office, Legislative Body, and public official is encouraged to solicit public participation in developing a meaningful Records Index. The completed Index shall be reviewed by the Commission and submitted for approval by the City Council.

D. The Index shall be periodically reviewed by Staff and Commission for accuracy and completeness.

E. A list of any change in the Index shall be noted on the City’s website and posted in each Berkeley public library for a period of at least three (3) months.

Section 1.30.280 Public Review File.

Any document relating to City business sent or received by a member of a Legislative Body shall be part of the Legislative Body’s Public Review File, which shall be organized in a manner that facilitates public access to the material. The Public Review File shall be maintained by a designated person for each Legislative Body and be accessible to any person during normal office hours. The City Clerk shall maintain a central registry of locations where Public Review Files can be accessed.

Section 1.30.290 Records of Officials: Appointment Calendars and Statements of Economic Interest.

A. All documents connected with City business that are prepared, received, or maintained by any elected or appointed City official, while in office, or by every department head are the property of the City. The originals of these documents shall be maintained in a professional manner and disclosed consistent with the Records Retention Ordinance and this Ordinance.

B. A calendar shall be maintained by all elected officials, the City Manager, the City Attorney, the Library Director and Trustees, the Rent Stabilization Program Director, and all department heads, listing by date, place, and time, all City-related meetings, appointments they make and meetings and conferences that they attend in person or by technological means. Such calendars shall be Public Records subject to disclosure, except for those parts, if any, specifically exempted by State and Federal law and shall be posted to the City’s website prior to the close of business each week.

C. No later than April 15th of each year, the City Clerk shall post on the City’s website all current and prior Statement of Economic Interest forms of members of Legislative Bodies, the City Manager, City Attorney, Rent Stabilization Program Director, and department heads.

Section 1.30.300 Contributions to the City.

A. Any gift of funds, goods, or services worth more than one hundred dollars ($100.00) in aggregate, which may be accepted or collected by the City or any of its functionaries or Legislative Bodies, for the purpose of carrying out or assisting any City function, shall be disclosed and approved on the Agenda of a regular Meeting of the City Council.

B. A list of such donations by donor, type, and amount shall be part of the Public Review File of the City Council.

C. A record of any gift of any size, distributed to any office or department, shall be part of the Public Review File of that office or department.

Section 1.30.310 Reports of Lobbying.

A. Any City Lobbyist shall file a quarterly report with the City Clerk, which shall be a Public Record. Each quarterly report shall identify all City-related financial expenditures by the Lobbyist, including name of each recipient, date, and the action that the Lobbyist supported or opposed in making the expenditure. The failure to file a quarterly report with the required disclosures shall be cause for termination of the contract for representation. The City Clerk shall post on the City’s website a direct link to the disclosure forms that the City’s Lobbyists file with the appropriate State and/or Federal agencies.

B. Special Interest Lobbyists shall file a report with the City Clerk, specifying by City-related issue all the dates, places, and names of the members of the Legislative Body they have contacted and the direct and indirect compensation received from their clients for such matters. This report shall also include, but not be limited to, fundraising activities conducted on behalf of elected City officials, contributions to persons and organizations, and payments received for services as a consultant to any City Legislative Body. No person who qualifies as a Special Interest Lobbyist shall contact any elected official of the City.
without first registering with the City Clerk and complying with the disclosure requirements of this Section. The City Council may establish a registration fee.

Section 1.30.320 Types of Information Accessible by the Public.

It is the intent of this Ordinance to provide for the disclosure, upon request, of all Public Records in printed or electronic form to the maximum extent permitted by State and Federal law and, wherever permitted, to waive the City’s right under State law to withhold disclosure in certain circumstances. Accordingly, disclosure shall be made in all cases where not specifically forbidden by State and Federal law, including but not limited to, the following:

A. Drafts and memoranda or written communications or drafts thereof between Staff, members of Legislative Bodies, and/or third parties shall be subject to disclosure at the time a final recommendation is delivered. Draft versions of an agreement being negotiated between the City and third parties must be preserved and made available for public review beginning fifteen (15) days prior to the presentation of the agreement for approval by a Legislative Body.

B. Litigation records and attorney-client communications shall not be subject to disclosure to the extent that they are protected from disclosure by State and Federal law. Other communications relating to the subject matter of such protected communications are Public Records, including without limitation pre-litigation claims against the City, records received or created by a department in the ordinary course of business that were not subject to the attorney-client privilege at the time of their creation, and amounts paid by or to others in connection with claims by or against the City. When litigation involving the City is finally adjudicated or otherwise settled, the text and terms of any settlement shall be subject to disclosure. No attorney representing the City shall solicit or agree to any settlement unless all information contained in it is exempt from disclosure under express provisions of State or Federal law. If the record requested contains both exempt and non-exempt information, then the exempt information shall be masked, but not removed and the masked portion shall be keyed by footnote or other reference to the justification for withholding the information.

No communication with a legal advisor to the City shall be exempt from disclosure as confidential attorney-client communication to the extent that it concerns an actual or potential conflict of interest, analyzes a proposed legislative position or administrative action of the City, or reports on the status of negotiations relating to a claim by or against the City.

C. Personnel Records, including but not limited to, those listed below shall be disclosed, except for those portions which are exempt from disclosure under State or Federal law.

1. Job descriptions.
2. Salary, benefits, and overtime pay provided to each current employee by name and position.
3. Pension and benefits provided to each retired employee by name and position.
4. Communications with a recognized employee organization.

D. Law enforcement reports prepared by the Berkeley Police Department are Public Records and must be disclosed, except as barred under State and Federal law, particularly as related to juveniles, domestic violence, and sex-related crimes and as specified below.

1. Identifying information of a victim of a crime of sexual assault shall not be made public without the express written permission of that person.
2. Parts of non-exempt police reports may be redacted to exclude material that would endanger the safety of a person or compromise the completion of an investigation. When such a redaction is made, a written explanation shall be provided.

E. Responses and other financial and qualifying documents relating to contracts, bids, and Requests for Proposals or Qualification shall be open to inspection immediately after the deadline for submittal has closed or the City has decided not to proceed.

F. All records concerning potential environmental impacts generated or received by the City, including but not limited to documents resulting from compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA), for projects wholly or partially within the City of Berkeley shall be made available to the public in any requested available format in accordance with Section 1.30.370.

Section 1.30.330 Access to Records.

A. No record shall be withheld from disclosure in its entirety unless all information contained in it is exempt from disclosure under express provisions of State or Federal law. If the record requested contains both exempt and non-exempt information, then the exempt information shall be masked, but not removed and the masked portion shall be keyed by footnote or other reference to the justification for withholding the information.

B. Nothing in this Section shall require programming a computer to respond to a request for information or to release information that would violate a licensing agreement or copyright law, provided that the provision in the agreement or legal authority precluding release is quoted and cited to the requestor.

C. The intent of this provision and its requisite open standards are to ensure the accessibility of all City information, which is not specifically exempted from public disclosure by State or Federal law. Technology will change over time; standards; standards bodies, and operating systems are noted here for reference only. To provide accessibility of information in electronic media, the City shall as soon as possible:

1. Use open, non-proprietary, cross-platform, standards-based text, image, audio, video, and other data exchange formats on public-facing computers and information systems.
2. Make an alternate format available when commercial, non-standard, or otherwise platform-listed formats must be used.
3. Meet or exceed the guidelines for accessibility specified by the Federal General Services Administration (Section 508, http://section508.gov).
4. Avoid binary document formats (such as image-based PDF or OOXML) when ASCII (PDF/A or ISO-8859-1) or other text-based formats are available. Rich-text documents should contain all fonts needed for their viewing. All document formats should be easily and entirely indexable for accurate searching.

5. Make audio available for both download and streaming using open, cross-platform, standards-based formats (such as OGG or MP3), which can be accessed from any computer (having Windows, Mac, Linux, Unix operating systems) or portable device (PDA or cell phone).

6. Use open, cross-platform, standards-based image formats such as those published by the ISO and W3C (PNG, JPEG).

7. Make video available for downloading and streaming using open, cross-platform, standards-based formats (such as Theora or MPEG). Make the audio portion of video-streams available separately.

8. Maintain websites and URLs with fixed and logical tree structures that do not change unnecessarily. Once posted, data should remain online.

9. Prohibit the use of tracking technologies (such as cookies, xss, and Google Analytics) in accessing public information.

10. Avoid web content-types that are not compatible across browsers, including older browsers (avoiding Flash and platform or browser-specific HTML, CSS, and Javascript).

11. Make substantive website changes trackable by title and synopsis in an open, cross-platform, standards-based journal format (such as RSS or Atom). Update these journals at least once per business day.

12. Index large files and make available by subsection, so that all elements can be downloaded or viewed on speed or size-limited platforms. Subsections should be no more than ten (10) pages of text and should be identifiable and accessible from their larger parent document. Audio and video files must have separate text indexes so that subsections can be quickly located and navigated to whether streamed or downloaded.

D. Access to non-exempt City information should not require action by Staff. Documents such as Agendas, minutes, bids, and requests for bids, should be digitized or converted to an open digital format (if necessary) and placed online when received. Staff and the public shall access non-exempt data from the same source. Exempt data should continue to be stored on separate internal computer systems.

Section 1.30.340 No Public Interest Balancing Test or Deliberative Process Privilege.

Neither the City nor any officer, employee, agent, or elected or non-elected official may assert California Public Records Act Section 6255 as of the effective date of this Ordinance, and/or its successor Section or any other provision of law that prohibits disclosure as the authority for withholding any information based on a finding or showing that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosure or on a claim of “deliberative process” privilege. Any denial of access to information must be based on an express provision of this Ordinance or on a specific exemption provided by State of Federal law.

Section 1.30.350 Process for Obtaining Records.

A. A person seeking access to information need not state his/her identity, reason for making the request or the use to which the information will be put, unless such disclosure is required by State or Federal law. However, for redress under this Ordinance, a person seeking such access is encouraged to make his/her request, in writing.

B. A Custodian of Records shall assist a requester in identifying the existence, form, and nature of the information sought. When requested, this Custodian shall provide within three (3) business days following receipt of the request, a written statement as to the existence, quantity, form, and nature of the records relating to a particular subject or question with enough specificity to enable the requester to identify and request the relevant records.

C. A Custodian of Records shall permit all portions of a Public Record that are not exempt from disclosure to be inspected by any person and shall provide copies thereof upon request.

D. Where the request is for a specific, readily identifiable, and available Public Record, the record shall be provided no later than the close of business on the next business day.

E. Where materials to be released are voluminous or in multiple locations, the materials may be released in stages, as they are gathered, but no later than the tenth (10th) business day following the request.

F. If the information requested involves more than one office or department, then the request shall be forwarded to the City Manager. The City Manager or his/her designee shall coordinate the timely response to the requester in accordance with this Ordinance.

G. If The Custodian of Records reasonably believes that part or all material requested is not a Public Record, The Custodian shall state in writing the basis for such denial within three (3) business days of receiving the request and shall, to the extent possible, suggest alternate ways of obtaining the desired information. The written explanation shall cite all facts and authority relied upon in denying the request.

H. Where State or Federal law gives the City discretion to withhold a particular Public Record, the City shall waive its right to withhold the record, except as specifically provided for in this Ordinance.

Section 1.30.360 Request for Waiver of Confidentiality.

A. Whenever The Custodian of Records asserts a justification for nondisclosure of a Public Record, an exemption based upon the interests of the individual or entity, he/
she shall cooperate with the requester’s efforts to communicate with the individual or entity using a blind- mailing process. This process includes the following elements:

1. The requester provides postage-paid envelopes for each of the individuals or entities sought to be contacted, with each envelope containing a letter explaining why the information is being sought and asking the person or entity to contact the requester, and

2. The City maintains confidentiality of the information by affixing all reasonably accessible addresses of involved subjects and mailing the envelopes, after including in each a statement that the subject of the information request must be legally competent to waive his or her privacy interests, but need not do so, and that the City is a disinterested party merely facilitating communication between citizens on matters that may be of public or private interest and is not liable for the result of any such communication. If the subject of the information request is legally competent and signs a privacy waiver for all or part of the information withheld, the City shall promptly release the information.

B. The City shall not be liable for any consequences of fulfilling its obligations under this Section.

Section 1.30.370 Fees for Records.

A. No fee shall be charged for making Public Records available for review.

B. No fee shall be charged for documents routinely produced in multiple copies for distribution to the public, e.g. Meeting Agendas.

C. Fees for documents copied on the order of the requester shall not exceed bulk rates charged by commercial copying services within the City for comparable services.

D. Copying of Public Records stored in electronic form shall be made available to the public in any medium at a charge no greater than the cost of the medium on which it is duplicated. Inspection of such records shall be at no cost.

E. Large documents that many members of the public are likely to want to study, such as City budgets and environmental review documents, including but not limited to those related to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA), shall be posted on the City’s website and made available for inspection at designated City offices and each Berkeley public library, where copies shall be made available for borrowing by the public.

Enforcement

Section 1.30.380 Sunshine Commission.

A Sunshine Commission ("the Commission") is established by this Ordinance. The responsibilities of the Commission include:

A. Ensuring that the City’s business is conducted in full view of the public to the maximum extent allowed by State and Federal law and this Ordinance;

B. Educating members of Legislative Bodies, Staff, and the public on the role of Sunshine in the City of Berkeley; and

C. Advising the Council and Staff on open government issues and suggest municipal ordinance changes as appropriate.

Section 1.30.390 Commission Membership.

A. The Commission shall consist of a number equal to the number of City Council members, one each appointed by every member of the City Council.

B. Each appointee shall be a resident of the City of Berkeley, but may not be an employee or volunteer in any City office, department, an elected official’s office, or a contractor, vendor, or the holder of an ownership interest in an entity that is a contractor or vendor of the City. In addition, an appointee shall not have committed an ethics violation that has led to loss of a professional license or been convicted of a felony.

C. All appointees shall have completed an application form which shall be developed by the City Clerk within ten (10) business days of the effective date of this Ordinance, and modifiable thereafter by the Commission. Such application shall include: i) a listing by the applicant of specific qualifications showing a demonstrated interest in participatory democracy in local government, ii) a statement signed by the applicant that he/she has read, understands, and supports the Ordinance and pledges to make decisions that are independent of the appointer and to work the number of hours required to ensure the Ordinance is fairly and fully implemented, and iii) a personal statement on why the applicant wants to serve on the Commission. All Commission applications are Public Records.

D. During the period of initial appointments and thereafter whenever there is a vacancy, the City Clerk shall publish notice of the vacancy in all Community Newspapers and on the City’s website. The City Clerk shall maintain a standing file of individuals who have submitted applications and groups that have requested to be notified of vacancies. When a vacancy arises, the City Clerk shall promptly notify all contacts in the standing file. All applications received by the City Clerk from any source shall be submitted to the Mayor and Council Members for their consideration.

E. There shall be no term limits for Commissioners. Terms shall run concurrently with the appointing Council Member’s term. Within sixty (60) days of the effective date of this Ordinance and thereafter after taking office, each Council Member shall appoint a new Commissioner or re-appoint an existing Commissioner, failing which the current Commissioner shall be deemed to be automatically reappointed. Once appointed or re-appointed, no Commissioner may be removed from office except in accordance with Section 1.30.450.

F. Substitute appointments are prohibited.

Section 1.30.400 Commission Vacancies and Removal for Cause.

A. A Commissioner’s service shall terminate upon:
   1. Death or voluntary resignation.
2. Conviction of a felony.
3. Unexcused absence from three (3) consecutive, properly noticed regular Meetings of the Commission or from 50% or more of all regular Meetings in a six-month reporting period as provided for in the City of Berkeley Commissioners' Manual.

4. Expiration of the term of office of the appointing Council Member.

B. A Commissioner may also be removed for cause by a three quarters (3/4) vote of the whole Commission, which shall occur at a public Meeting noticed in accord with this Ordinance. Such removal shall be reflected in a written finding that the Commissioner in question:
   1. Is no longer able or willing to perform the duties of a Commissioner, or
   2. Has failed to meet one or more of the conditions described in Section 1.30.390 B and C, or
   3. Has participated in and voted on an issue that constitutes a material conflict of interest for the Commissioner, or
   4. Has communicated, except in a public Meeting, with members of a Legislative Body regarding the merits of a disputed matter that is currently before the Commission or its Enforcement Committee.

C. Where a vacancy has been created for any of the reasons stated in this Section, it shall be filled within thirty (30) days by the appointing Council Member from the pool of applicants for Commission positions maintained by the City Clerk as described in Section 1.30.399. Failure to do so will result in the Commission making the appointment within thirty (30) days after the Council Member fails to make an appointment.

Section 1.30.410 Organizational Period.

A. The first Meeting of the Commission shall take place within sixty (60) days after the Ordinance is enacted into law. By the conclusion of the first Meeting, the Commission shall, by majority vote, elect a Chair and a Vice Chair, each to a term of one (1) year. Thereafter, at the conclusion of each Chair’s and Vice Chair’s term, the Commission shall elect replacements. No Chair or Vice Chair shall serve for more than two (2) consecutive terms. Should a Chair or Vice Chair leave the Commission, the Commission shall elect a new Chair or Vice Chair to finish that term.

B. Within thirty (30) days of the election of the Chair and Vice Chair, the Commission, by a majority vote, shall appoint three-member Enforcement Committees (each hereinafter referred to as a “Committee”) so that each Commissioner shall serve on at least one Committee and the duties of the Committees shall be divided in an equitable manner.

C. Within six (6) months after the election of the Chair and Vice Chair, the Commission shall, with public input, determine and publish the procedures governing its activities and Meetings, which shall be consistent with the provisions of this Ordinance.

D. Within thirty (30) days of its first Meeting, the Commission shall develop a Sunshine Alert Form for use in accord with Section 1.30.160.

Section 1.30.420 Commission Staffing.

The City shall provide a part-time Staff person to the Commission to act as its secretary. The Commission shall review and make recommendations to the City Manager regarding the qualifications and job description for this position. Two (2) members of the Commission, selected by a majority vote of the Commission, shall sit on the interview panel and make recommendations to the City Manager regarding the applicants.

Section 1.30.430 Role of City Attorney.

A. The City Attorney may publish legal opinions in response to a request from any person as to whether a record is public.

B. All communications to or from the City Attorney’s Office with regard to this Ordinance, including but not limited to petitions, requests for opinion, and opinions, shall be Public Records unless specifically determined to be subject to the attorney-client privilege.

Section 1.50.440 Commission Legal Counsel.

The City Attorney shall, upon request, provide legal counsel for the Commission. If a majority of the Commission or the City Attorney determines that there is a conflict of interest, which the Commission declines to waive, the City shall, at the Commission’s request, provide the reasonable fees and expenses of outside counsel chosen by the Commission, from the City Attorney’s budget to retain outside counsel.

Section 1.30.450 Enforcement: General Procedures.

A. In addition to any other remedies available under the law and subject to procedures established by the Commission in a form consistent with the provisions hereof, any interested party may file a petition for relief with the Commission alleging a violation of the Ordinance.

B. Petitioner and the City as respondent shall appear at the initial hearing of any petition brought hereunder or appeal thereof and may be represented by counsel. Each shall be given the opportunity to present evidence and argument and to cross-examine any witness for the other party. All participants shall be under oath.

C. Such petitions shall be heard by an Enforcement Committee at a public Meeting within seven (7) business days of receipt, or at a later date agreed to by petitioner and respondent.

   1. The Committee shall render a written decision within five (5) business days of the close of the hearing and inform all interested parties of the decision. Unless appealed, the decision of the majority of the Committee shall be deemed to be that of the Commission as a whole.
   2. Where such decision is made by the Enforcement Committee, any dissenting member thereof or the petitioner or respondent may file a written appeal to the Commission within five (5) business days of the issuance of the notice decision.
   D. The Commission shall hear such appeal at its next
1. By a majority vote, the Commission shall issue its decision on an appeal based on this Ordinance, the record that was made before the Commission, and information received at the Meeting.

2. If the Commission fails to reach a decision within five (5) business days, the initial decision by the Committee shall stand.

E. Decisions of the Commission may be appealed to the City Council by any party to the relevant dispute.

1. Any such appeal must be filed with the City Clerk within five (5) business days of the issuance of the notice of decision; otherwise the decision of the Commission shall stand.

2. Within thirty (30) days after the date the appeal first appears on the Agenda of the City Council, the Council must either affirm the decision of the Sunshine Commission and dismiss the appeal, or set the matter for public hearing. Consideration of any such appeal shall not be moved to the Consent Calendar.

3. Within thirty (30) days after the date on which the public hearing was opened, the Council must make a decision which shall be based on explicit findings, this Ordinance, and the record. This decision must be accompanied by a specific recommendation and/or statement regarding any corrective action and/or whatever other matters the Council wishes to place before the City Manager regarding the subject of the appeal.

4. If the Council overturns the Commission’s decision, the Commission may review the decision to determine further action.

F. Commission or Committee Meetings to review petitions and appeals require at least seventy-two (72) hours public notice which shall, be given in writing to the petitioner and The Custodian of Records. Other deadlines for Meeting notices and Agendas specified in this Ordinance do not apply to Sunshine Ordinance enforcement procedures due to their time-sensitive nature and the necessity to conduct City business in a timely way.

G. The Commission and each Committee shall maintain records consisting of all written submissions, testimony, and other evidence of all hearings and appeals, including video and/or audio recordings.

H. The Commission shall prepare an annual report of alleged violations of the Ordinance brought to its attention during the previous calendar year. The report shall identify the nature of the alleged violation, the relief sought by each petition, the disposition or current status thereof, and the location of all records relevant to each petition. With advance notice to The Custodian of Records, the Commission may also request a tally of records requests for statistical or comparative purposes.

Section 1.30.460 Enforcement: Public Records Access Denials.

A. Any one who believes the City has not fully complied with a request for Public Records may file a written petition with the Commission. The merits of such petition and of any appeal shall be determined in the manner described in Section 1.30.450.

B. The Commission shall immediately forward a copy of the petition to The Custodian of Records.

C. Where a document has been reasonably identified and is in City custody, it shall be presumed to be a Public Record, and A Custodian of Records or The Custodian of Records shall have the burden of overcoming such presumption.

D. If the determination is that the record is public, and no appeal has been taken, A Custodian of Records or The Custodian of Records shall comply with the request immediately.

E. If A Custodian of Records or The Custodian of Records fails to comply with a decision requiring production within three (3) business days of its issuance, any interested party or the Commission itself may notify the City Attorney, Grand Jury and/or District Attorney, who may take further action as appropriate.

F. Staff who have used the procedures and definitions set forth in this Ordinance shall not be disciplined for complying with a request for Public Records.

Section 1.30.470 Enforcement: Public Meeting and Noticing Violations.

A. Any interested party, within seven (7) business days of an alleged violation of the Meetings provisions of this Ordinance, may file a petition with the Commission. The merits of the petition or of any appeal shall be determined by the Commission or Enforcement Committee, as described in Section 1.30.450.

B. Where the Committee or Commission finds that an action has been taken in violation of this Ordinance and available appeal rights have been exhausted, the City shall suspend implementation of the action pending judicial review or take a new action in conformance with this Ordinance. Nothing herein shall limit the jurisdiction of the Court on review to award interim equitable relief at the request of either party or on its own motion.

C. In the event of an action under Section 1.30.480 or related to a Closed Session, allegedly privileged tapes shall be recoverable by a plaintiff subject to the respondent’s right to seek a protective order and pending review by the court in camera to determine the conditions under which production may occur.

Section 1.30.480 Judicial Review.

A. The Commission, and/or the City may seek a Writ of Mandate from the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Alameda regarding issues including but not limited to a petition to identify and/or produce Public Records; a legislative or other action allegedly taken in violation of the provisions of this Ordinance; a timely decision that has not been rendered; or an allegation that the City has failed to comply with a decision made by a Committee or the Commission. The Court’s review may be de novo and based on the full record maintained by the Committee and/or Commission. Where a violation is
found, the Court may award appropriate relief which could include the voiding of any legislative or other action taken in violation of this Ordinance.

B. The provisions of Section 1.30.440 shall govern attorney’s fees paid by the City in any legal action taken before the Superior Court by the Commission pursuant to this Ordinance. Other petitioners, if partly or fully successful, shall be awarded reasonable attorneys’ fees. The City may be awarded its fees only if it is successful in defeating a petition found to be frivolous.

C. In the event of an action under this Section or related to a Closed Session, allegedly privileged tapes shall be discoverable by a plaintiff subject to the respondent’s right to seek a protective order and pending review by the court in camera to determine the conditions under which production may occur.

D. The remedies provided under this Section shall in no way limit any person’s right to seek a Writ of Mandate or use of other available administrative or judicial remedies.

**Section 1.30.490 Penalties.**

The willful failure of any elected official or City employee to discharge any duties imposed by any State or Federal statute or this Ordinance shall be punishable as provided by existing Federal, State and local law.

**Severability**

**Section 1.30.500 Severability.**

If any part or provision of this Ordinance is found by a court of law to be in conflict with or in violation of the Berkeley City Charter or any applicable State or Federal statute or administrative or judicial decision, and if a court should declare such portion, provision, or provisions of the Ordinance to be illegal, invalid, unlawful, void, or unenforceable as written, then such portion, provision, or provisions shall be given force to the fullest possible extent that they are legal, valid, and enforceable, and the remainder of this Ordinance shall be considered to be legal, valid and enforceable.

To the extent this Ordinance directly or indirectly incorporates provisions of State law, and such law is repealed or changed in a way that materially limits the rights of the people under Sections 6250 - 6276 or 54950 - 54963 of the California Government Code, this Ordinance shall be construed as continuing in full force and effect to the fullest possible extent, including as a part hereof the relevant portions of State law as they existed on the effective date of this Ordinance.

**End of Chapter**
V

Shall an ordinance requiring the City to publish certified biennial reports of its 20-year financial obligations for employee/retiree expenses, capital improvements and capital assets, and “productive capacity of City services”, the present value of those obligations, and the annual expenses needed to meet them, and prohibiting any new or increased debt financing, property-related fee, assessment or tax absent certification of the report by the City Manager or other, independent professional, be adopted?

Financial Implications: Uncertain.

CITY ATTORNEY’S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE V

The proposed ordinance would require the City to prepare and publish by March 1, 2013, a Certified Financial Report (“Report”) of the City’s financial obligations for the next twenty year period for employee and retiree expenses, capital improvements and capital assets, and the “productive capacity of City services (collectively “Long Term Obligations”). It would also require an evaluation of the present value of these Long Term Obligations and the yearly expenses needed to meet them. The proposed ordinance requires an updated Report be prepared and published by the first Monday in March of each odd-numbered year.

The proposed ordinance would require that either the City Manager or an independent professional who has audited a Report certify in writing that the information in the Report or updated Report is reasonably accurate and complies with the requirements of the ordinance.

The proposed ordinance purports to prohibit the City Council and the voters from incurring or approving any debt financing, or imposing any new tax, assessment or property-related fee, or increasing any existing tax, assessment or property-related fee, or scheduling any election to impose or increase any tax, assessment or property-related fee, unless the City has prepared and published a biennial financial Report and such Report has been certified, except as required by the City Charter or state law.

Examples of debt financing, taxes, assessments and property-related fees that would be affected by the proposed ordinance and could not be adopted, renewed or increased in the absence of a certified Report, would include, but not be limited to:

• annual tax revenue anticipation notes, which are issued to maintain the City’s cash flow pending receipt of property taxes from Alameda County; and
• refunding bonds (to refund outstanding bonds at lower interest rates).

The ordinance provision preventing approval debt financing, taxes assessments and property-related fees absent a certified Report would conflict with the City Council’s authority under the City Charter by delegating Council authority to the City Manager or another party who is a “competent, independent professional”, and appears to limit the rights of voters and property owners under the California Constitution to approve taxes, bonds, benefit assessments and fees.

s/ZACH COWAN
Berkeley City Attorney
**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE V**

Vote YES for the FACTS – Fiscal Accountability, Clarity, Transparency and Sustainability.

**Berkeley faces insolvency or worse.** We have at least $1.2 billion in unfunded obligations which will grow, exponentially, if not properly addressed. The City has no plan to deal with this crisis. The FACTS Ordinance is the critical first step and would require the City to tell us the truth. Good government requires accurate facts and transparency. Only then can Berkeley residents, working together, develop a comprehensive plan to solve this problem.

**Commitments have been made that cannot be kept.** Through well-meaning but misguided generosity our City has paid its employees’ contribution toward their retirement while total employee costs are eating up an ever-increasing percent of the operating budget leaving fewer dollars for other vital City needs. For too many years the City has balanced the annual budget by cutting safety net services for our young, elderly and poor residents, by allowing our parks streets, pools, storm drains and buildings to decay and by draining emergency fund reserves.

In January 2010, under citizen pressure, Council passed a resolution requiring the City Manager to prepare a full report on the City’s financial obligations. The resolution was ignored; no report has been made. Resolutions can be ignored. This ordinance cannot.

**Without the truth and a plan it is premature to impose new taxes.**

Join us in supporting Measure V

Committee for FACTS

Claremont-Elmwood Neighborhood Association (CENA)

Northeast Berkeley Association (NEBA)

Berkeley Budget SOS

Council of Neighborhood Associations (CNA)

LeConte Neighborhood Association

s/Mark Humbert
President – Claremont Elmood Neighborhood Assn

s/Isabelle Gaston
President, Northeast Berkeley Association (NEBA)

s/Ted Edlin
President, Council of Neighborhood Associations (CNA)

s/Shannon R Brown
Director, Berkeley Budget SOS

s/Jesse Arreguin
Berkeley City Councilmember

**REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE V**

Our City does not face insolvency. We have substantial reserves and a AA+ bond rating. Though virtually everyone agrees that we have significant unfunded liabilities that must be addressed, Measure V is not the answer.

Measure V could cripple the City’s ability to pay its own bills, damage its credit rating and cost the City millions of dollars in higher interest rates. The issue is not the report itself but the required ‘certification’ of the report and the likely possibility that it will be challenged thereby freezing the ability of the City to manage its financial affairs. Because Measure V does not define “certification”, it will be open to interpretation and controversy.

The City Council is committed to implementing recommendations from the City Auditor to increase transparency in providing the relevant information. In May of 2012, the City Council instructed the City Manager to provide a single report containing all of this information in a transparent format on a biennial basis. It must be published in a single accessible document, available to the public and Council as they begin the biennial budget process.

Addressing the issue of our unfunded liabilities will take the goodwill and effort of all of us: our leaders, our citizens and our employees. The threat of crippling our City financially will do nothing toward advancing this process.

Measure V could cripple the City financially.

Measure V could cost the City millions of dollars.

Measure V is bad government.

Vote No on Measure V.

s/Sherry Smith
President, League of Women Voters of Berkeley, Albany & Emeryville

s/Winston Burton
Chair, Berkeley Board of Libraries Trustees

s/Paul W. Hammond
Certified Public Accountant

s/Laurie Capitelli
Berkeley City Councilmember

s/Loni Hancock
State Senator
ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE V

MEASURE V IS BAD FISCAL POLICY

It could put Berkeley at financial risk because the measure is poorly written with undefined terms. There is a serious risk that disputes could delay “certification” plunging the City into a fiscal nightmare. If the required biennial report showing a 20 year projection of expenses is not “certified” on time, the City could not collect any tax or fee increase – even those approved by voters – or restructure debt.

THE RISK OF FISCAL CONSEQUENCES IS TOO HIGH.

• Inevitable lawsuits surrounding “certification” would prevent the city from conducting municipal business until lawsuits are resolved.
• If certification is delayed through no fault of the City, the City cannot secure trans-financing – the short term loans the City routinely takes – at very favorable rates – to smooth cash flows.
• Inability to finance loans would negatively affect our bond rating, currently at AA+.
• Opportunities to refinance bonds at favorable rates could be delayed or missed, leading to potentially significant losses.
• There is no provision for possible need of emergency funds in the event of disasters, such as wildfires or earthquakes.

OTHER REQUIRED REPORTS ALREADY FULFILL THE OBJECTIVE.

• On May 29, 2012, the City Council passed an ordinance requiring that similar reports be compiled: a report on infrastructure and asset costs covering a 5-Year projection; and a report on employee and retiree costs covering a 10-Year projection.
• Measure V requires reporting on the same expenses as the May 29, 2012 ordinance, but for a 20 year period, which is largely conjectural in the out years, and therefore of limited additional value.

Putting in place an onerous – and potentially dangerous – enforcement provision, for a report that is already essentially available does nothing to better plan our financial obligations and future.

VOTE “NO” ON MEASURE V.

s/Sherry Smith
President, League of Women Voters of Berkeley, Albany & Emeryville
s/Loni Hancock
State Senator
s/Susan Wengraf
Berkeley City Council Member
s/Judith L Bloom
C.P.A.

s/Gordon Wozniak
Berkeley City Councilmember
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REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE V

FACTS IS GOOD POLICY and GOOD GOVERNMENT

FACTS opponents argue: The FACTS Ordinance is unclear and unnecessary and reports require risky “certifications.” Nonsense!

FACTS Reporting Requirements Are Clear.

• FACTS reporting requirements are substantially the same as those found in the resolution Council passed unanimously in January 2010. (See, www.committee4facts.com)
• For 2-1/2 years, the Council and City Manager have ignored the reporting requirements in their January 2010 resolution.
• In April 2011, Councilmember Wozniak explained: We pass resolutions all the time and don’t expect them to be followed.

FACTS Ordinance Is Necessary.

• FACTS addresses Berkeley’s staggering $1.2+ billion in unfunded obligations.
• Berkeley residents need to know what is behind our increasing expenses, decreasing services and crumbling infrastructure.
• Mayor Bates conceded: “I don’t think the [FACTS] initiative does anything that we don’t want to do anyway” (May 29, 2012 Council meeting).
• Only after the FACTS initiative was filed with enough signatures to qualify, did Council pass by split vote an unenforceable, watered-down resolution mimicking the FACTS initiative.
• As before, the new Council resolution can be ignored. The FACTS Ordinance cannot.

FACTS Requires No Risky Certification.

• “Certification” is clearly defined in Paragraph B (“I have read the report and believe the report…is reasonably accurate…”).
• The City Manager can certify the reports.
• If Berkeley prepares FACTS reports as they must, Council’s freedom to tax or finance debt will not be restricted.

INSIST on the FACTS!

VOTE “YES” ON MEASURE V.

s/L. Tim Wallace
Economist and Former California Director of Food and Agriculture; and, on behalf of Steering Committee, Berkeley Budget SOS
s/Karl J. Reeh
President, Le Conte Neighborhood Association
s/Carmine Guerro
Partner (Retired) Big 4 Accounting Firm and Qualified Audit Committee Financial Expert as Defined by SEC Rules
s/Isabelle Gaston
President, Northeast Berkeley Association (NEBA)

s/Jacquelyn McCormick
Mayoral Candidate, Berkeley Council Watch, Berkeley Budget SOS
THE BERKELEY FISCAL ACCOUNTABILITY, CLARITY, TRANSPARENCY AND SUSTAINABILITY ORDINANCE OF 2012

Section xxx.xx Title of Chapter.

This Chapter of the Berkeley Municipal Code shall be known as The Berkeley Fiscal Accountability, Clarity, Transparency and Sustainability Ordinance of 2012 (“The Berkeley FACTS Ordinance”).

Section xxx.xx Findings.

A. The City needs to plan better for its long-term financial needs.

B. The City needs to avoid short-term measures that worsen its long-term financial problems.

C. Early planning for baseline expenditure changes is critical to ensuring continued financial stability.

D. Years of limited funding and deferred maintenance have resulted in an aging City infrastructure that desperately needs replacement, repair and improvement.

E. The City’s projected revenue growth will not keep up with current and projected expenditures for City employees, and unless significant changes are made, there will be substantial decreases in available funding for vital City services.

F. The City needs to reduce its unfunded liabilities for employee costs, physical infrastructure and capital improvements, better manage its expenditures, and set aside funds adequate to meet long-term financial needs.

Section xxx.xx Purpose.

The purpose of this Chapter is to ensure that a reasonably accurate evaluation of the City’s long-term financial obligations is regularly prepared and certified so that the City Council, Berkeley residents, City employees and retirees, and City creditors have the reliable financial information needed for responsible budget preparation and evaluation, prudent City management, and sensible tax, debt and other revenue planning.

Section xxx.xx Report on City’s Long-Term Obligations.

A. By March 1, 2013, the City of Berkeley shall prepare and publish a certified report (the “Report”) of the City’s twenty-year obligations for all employee and retiree expenses, and the City’s obligations for prudent capital improvements of the City’s physical infrastructure, capital assets, and productive capacity of City services (the “Long-Term Obligations”). The Report shall include a comprehensive evaluation of the Long-Term Obligations and their present value and shall include the likely yearly expenses reasonably needed to meet the City’s exposure to such Long-Term Obligations. The Report shall include an appendix that clearly sets forth all significant assumptions relied upon in the Report. On the first Monday in March of each odd-numbered year after 2013, the City of Berkeley shall prepare and publish an updated Report that extends the period covered for an additional two years so that each updated report covers the next twenty-year time period (the “Updated Report”).

B. At the time of its publication, the City Manager shall certify in writing that each Report or Updated Report, including its underlying facts, opinions and assumptions, is reasonably accurate and complies with paragraph A above, or in the alternative, the City of Berkeley shall have obtained a certification from a competent, independent professional who has audited the Report or Updated Report, and has found it, including its underlying facts, opinions and assumptions, to be reasonably accurate. The certification shall read: “I have read the report and believe the report, including its underlying facts, opinions and assumptions, is reasonably accurate and complies with paragraph A of The Berkeley FACTS Ordinance.”

C. Except as otherwise required by the Charter of the City of Berkeley or the general law of the State, after March 1, 2013, the City of Berkeley shall not incur any debt financing, or impose any new tax, assessment or fee, or increase any existing tax, assessment or fee, or schedule any election to impose or increase any tax, assessment or fee, unless at the time of such action a Report or Updated Report has been prepared, certified and published in compliance with paragraphs A and B above. The term “fee” includes only those property-related fees covered by State Proposition 218.

Section xxx.xx Severability.

If any sentence, clause, section or part of this Chapter is found to be unconstitutional, illegal or invalid, such unconstitutionality, illegality or invalidity shall affect only such sentence, clause, section or part of this Chapter and shall not affect or impair any of the remaining provisions, sentences, clauses, sections or parts of this Chapter.

End of Chapter
City Council Election Dates
Shall the City change its general municipal election date from odd-numbered years to even-numbered years and add an extra year to the term of the existing Council members and Mayor to make that change?
Fiscal Impact: Saves approximately $250,000 per election starting with the next election in 2014.

BALLOT SUMMARY
City Council Election Dates
The City of Livermore holds Council and Mayoral elections in November of odd-numbered years. This schedule means that Livermore voters elect their Councilmembers and Mayor in years when elections for Statewide and National offices typically are not held. The City Council placed this measure on the ballot to match Councilmember and Mayoral elections to Statewide and National elections in even-numbered years.

This measure also would add one year to the terms of the incumbent Councilmembers and Mayor, to allow for the transition of elections to even-numbered years. If this measure passes, an alternative measure the City Council placed on the ballot to add the extra year instead to the incoming elected Councilmembers and Mayor will be moot, as this measure will control.

CITY ATTORNEY’S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE W
CHANGE IN CITY COUNCIL ELECTION DATES TO EVEN-NUMBERED YEARS; IMMEDIATE APPLICATION
The Livermore City Council placed this measure on the ballot to amend the City’s Municipal Code and change Livermore’s municipal elections from odd-numbered years to even-numbered years. Presently, Livermore’s voters elect their Councilmembers and Mayor in November of odd-numbered years. Since this schedule of elections is the result of a previous ballot measure in 1982, any change in dates also must follow the approval of a ballot measure.

This measure would change election dates for the Councilmembers and Mayor from odd- to even-numbered years beginning in 2014. It also would add one year to the terms of the existing Councilmembers and Mayor to make the change of elections to even-numbered years possible.

The purpose for changing election years is to reduce costs by consolidating Livermore’s elections with Statewide and National elections, which are held in even-numbered years. Election costs vary depending on the number of jurisdictions participating in an election. Since more jurisdictions participate in even-numbered year elections, costs for those elections are lower. Voter turnout in even-numbered years is generally higher also because of participation in Statewide and National elections.

Livermore’s City Clerk estimated that the City’s November 2013 election would cost $330,000, while a 2014 election would cost $50,000. The precise amount of savings is difficult to predict, but the City would likely recognize cost savings of approximately $280,000 per general election by holding elections in even-numbered years.

If Livermore changes its elections to even-numbered years, it must alter the terms of office by one year to “reset” those terms to even-numbered years. This measure does that by adding a year to the existing Council’s terms. An alternative measure on this ballot also would change elections to even-numbered years, but do so by adding the extra year to the terms of the next-elected Councilmembers and Mayor.

If this measure is adopted, it will control over the alternative measure. If this measure is unsuccessful but the alternative measure passes, elections will change to even-numbered years and the incoming Councilmembers and Mayor will have an extra year added to their terms.

If this measure passes, the current Councilmembers and the Mayor, whose terms would have expired after the 2013 election, will serve through November 2014, when their successors are elected and qualified. The current Councilmembers whose terms would have expired after the 2015 election will serve until their successors are elected November 2016 and qualified.

This amendment would become effective according to law if a majority of the electors voting on the measure at the
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE W

City Council Election Dates

Livermore is one of only three cities in Alameda County which elect their City Council in odd-year elections. Since Livermore has the largest number of registered voters, Livermore must pay most of the costs charged by the Registrar of Voters to conduct an election. Livermore paid the Registrar over $280,000 for the 2011 election, or over $6.00 per registered voter. For even-year elections, Livermore pays only $1.00 per registered voter because more cities participate and costs are spread over a larger population. As a comparison, Pleasanton paid $41,000 for their share of the 2010 election.

Election costs have risen steadily over the last ten years and will continue to climb. Livermore’s cost for the 2001 election was $67,800. It’s projected that the scheduled 2013 election will cost Livermore over $300,000. Had the Council election been held in the November 2008 General Election, Livermore’s cost would have been $32,000, almost ninety percent less.

Measure W moves the Livermore General Election to the even-year cycle by extending the terms of the incumbent city council members and the mayor by one year. The alternative option of moving to the even-year cycle would be to hold two more odd-year elections, in which the incoming elected officials’ terms would be extended by one year. With the second option, Measure X, the City would lose the opportunity to save over $500,000 by having to cover the cost of two more odd-year elections.

By moving Livermore’s elections to even-numbered years, it’s estimated that the City will save over $250,000 per election cycle beginning next year. The City can put those funds to far better use. Voting to move the Council elections to the even-year General Election cycle simply makes good fiscal sense. Vote yes on Measure W.

LIVERMORE CITY COUNCIL

s/John Marchand
Mayor
s/Doug Horner
Vice Mayor
s/Stewart Gary
Council Member
s/Laureen Turner
Council Member
s/Bob Woerner
Council Member

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE W WAS SUBMITTED
FULL TEXT OF MEASURE W

City Council Election Dates

Shall the City change its general municipal election date from odd-numbered years to even-numbered years and add an extra year to the term of the existing Council members and Mayor to make that change?

Fiscal Impact: Saves approximately $250,000 per election starting with the next election in 2014.


The general municipal elections of the City shall be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November of each even-numbered year, commencing with the year 2014. All other municipal elections that may be called under the authority by the general laws shall be known as special elections.

Notwithstanding the two-year term set forth in Chapter 2.04 for the office of the Mayor, the Mayor’s term of office that would have expired in 2013 shall continue in the office until the November 2014 election. Notwithstanding the four-year City Council member term, any Council member whose term of office would have expired as of 2013 shall continue in their offices until the November 2014 election, and any Council member whose term of office would have expired as of 2015 shall continue in their offices until the November 2016 election.
City Council Election Dates - Alternative. If the City’s voters do not approve of an immediate change in Livermore’s general municipal election date, shall the City change to even-numbered years by adding a year to the terms of the incoming Council members and Mayor at the general municipal elections in 2013 and 2015?

Fiscal Impact: Costs approximately $750,000 for transition elections, then saves approximately $250,000 per election, starting in 2018.

BALLOT SUMMARY
City Council Election Dates - Alternative
The City of Livermore holds Councilmember and Mayoral elections in November of odd-numbered years. This schedule means that Livermore voters elect their Councilmembers and Mayor outside of years when elections for Statewide and National offices typically take place. This measure would match the dates for Councilmember and Mayoral elections to Statewide and National elections.

This measure also would add one year to the terms of the Councilmembers and Mayor at the next election for those offices. This will allow for a multi-year transition of elections to even-numbered years, starting after the next municipal election in 2013. Thus, for example, Councilmembers elected in 2013 would hold five-year terms and serve until the 2018 election. The Mayor also would be elected in 2013, but, because of the usual two-year term for that position, would serve until an election in 2016.

The City Council placed this measure on the ballot as an alternative to the measure that adds the extra year instead to the incumbent Councilmembers and Mayor. If that measure passes by a majority of the votes cast, it will control over this ballot measure, and the sitting Councilmembers and Mayor will have their terms extended by one year. If that measure does not pass and this one does, this measure will be effective and the Councilmembers and Mayor elected at the next elections will receive the extra year for their terms.

CITY ATTORNEY’S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS
OF MEASURE X
CHANGE IN CITY COUNCIL ELECTION DATES TO EVEN-NUMBERED YEARS; DELAYED APPLICATION
The Livermore City Council placed this measure on the ballot to amend the City’s Municipal Code and change Livermore’s elections from odd-numbered years to even-numbered years. Livermore elects its Councilmembers and Mayor in November of odd-numbered years. This schedule is the result of a previous ballot measure in 1982, so any date change must likewise come after voter approval.

This measure would gradually change election dates for the Mayor and Councilmembers from odd- to even-numbered years. It also would add one year to the terms of the incoming elected Councilmembers and Mayor to make the change of elections to even-numbered years possible.

The purpose for changing election years is to reduce costs by consolidating Livermore’s elections with Statewide and National elections, which are held in even-numbered years. Election costs vary depending on the number of jurisdictions participating in an election. Since more jurisdictions participate in even-numbered year elections, costs for those elections are lower. Voter turnout in even-numbered years generally is higher, also, because of participation in Statewide and National elections.

If Livermore changes its elections to even-numbered years, it must alter the terms of office by one year to “reset” those terms to even-numbered years. This measure does that by adding a year to the incoming Councilmember and Mayor’s terms. Incoming Councilmembers from the 2013 election will serve until the November 2018 election. The Mayor’s term is two years, which otherwise would expire in 2015. This measure will direct that he or she serve through the November 2016 election. Councilmembers elected in 2015 will serve until November 2020. As of 2016, the Councilmembers and Mayor elected will serve four- and two-year terms, respectively, consistent with the existing Municipal Code provisions.

Livermore’s City Clerk estimated that odd-year elections cost $330,000, while even-year elections cost $50,000. Because of staggered Councilmember terms, a phase-in period is necessary to arrive at terms that coincide with even-numbered years. Elections would take place in 2013, 2015, and 2016 before elections will be held every other, even-numbered year. The City Clerk estimates that the City will incur about $660,000 in election expenses for odd years until it realizes savings by combining City elections with regular Statewide and National elections. After that, the City would realize cost savings of approximately $280,000 per general election.

A different measure on this ballot also changes the election date, but adds the extra year to the incumbent Councilmembers and Mayor. If that passes by a majority of the votes cast in this election, it will control over this ballot.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE X

City Council Election Dates - Alternative

As stated in the argument in favor of Measure W, it makes good fiscal sense for the City of Livermore to move to an even-year election cycle. This measure is on the ballot to provide an alternative means of moving to an even-year election cycle in the event that Measure W fails to pass. Instead of extending the terms of the incumbent mayor and city council members by one year, two more odd-year elections would be held. In the first of the additional odd-year elections, the term of the mayor would be extended once to a three-year term and the terms of two of the council members would be extended once to five year terms. In the second odd-year election, the terms for the remaining two council members would be extended once to five year terms. In the next even-year election, the mayor’s term would return to two years. This would delay the benefits of even-year elections by five years and have an additional net cost of an estimated $500,000 to pay for the two additional odd-year elections. However, it would still enable the City to significantly reduce the election costs eventually. As a precaution, those in favor of reducing election costs by moving to even-year elections without any additional delay as proposed in Measure W, should also vote yes on Measure X in the event that Measure W does not pass.

LIVERMORE CITY COUNCIL

s/John Marchand
Mayor
s/Doug Horner
Vice Mayor
s/Stewart Gary
Council Member
s/Laureen Turner
Council Member
s/Bob Woerner
Council Member

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE X WAS SUBMITTED
FULL TEXT OF MEASURE X
City Council Election Dates – Alternative
If the City’s voters do not approve of an immediate change in Livermore’s general municipal election date, shall the City change to even-numbered election years by adding a year to the terms of the incoming Council members and Mayor at the general municipal elections in 2013 and 2015?

Fiscal Impact: Costs approximately $750,000 for transition elections, then saves approximately $250,000 per election, starting in 2018.

The general municipal elections of the City shall be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November of each even-numbered year, commencing with the election for Mayor in the year 2016. All other municipal elections that may be called under the authority by the general laws shall be known as special elections.

Notwithstanding the two-year term set forth in Chapter 2.04 for the office of the Mayor, the Mayor’s term of office that commences with the 2013 election shall continue until the November 2016 election. Thereafter, the Mayor’s term of office shall continue as a two-year term. Notwithstanding the four-year City Councilmember term, any Councilmember whose term of office commences with the 2013 election shall continue in their offices until the November 2018 election, and any Councilmember whose term of office commences with the 2015 election shall continue in their offices until the November 2019 election.
CITY ATTORNEY’S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE Y

Measure Y would continue an existing Municipal Services Tax that has been collected in Piedmont since 1980. Every four years thereafter, the voters have approved extensions of the tax.

Revenue from the Municipal Services Tax goes to the City’s General Fund and therefore can be used to fill gaps when residents’ demand for city services exceeds the funds generated by real property taxes, sales taxes and other revenue. The General Fund provides Piedmonters with basic services such as police and fire protection, street maintenance, building regulations, library services, recreation, parks maintenance, planning and public works.

Measure Y does not increase the current tax rate or change the procedure for setting the rate; it merely extends the life of the tax for another four years to June 30, 2017. The tax rate would continue to vary by parcel depending on the size and the nature of a parcel’s use (i.e., residential/commercial). Advanced notice and a public hearing would continue to be provided before the City Council sets the annual tax rate.

The Municipal Service Tax must be used locally and will undergo annual financial review.

A “Yes” vote on Measure Y means the voter is in favor of continuing the existing tax.

A “No” vote on Measure Y means the voter is opposed and the existing tax would no longer be collected.

Two-thirds (66%) of the qualified voters casting a vote in favor would approve Measure Y.

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure Y. The full text of Measure Y is printed in the Voter’s Information Pamphlet and is also available on the City of Piedmont’s website at: http://www.ci.piedmont.ca.us.

s/THOMAS R. CURRY
City Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE Y

Measure Y RENEWS an existing tax that provides funds to maintain existing city services. Measure Y provides funding for Piedmont’s: superb police, fire and paramedic services; library access, and other services as well as park and playground maintenance; street and sidewalk repairs; capital improvements; equipment maintenance and replacement.

For the past 32 years, Piedmont voters have approved a special tax called the Municipal Services Tax (“the parcel tax”) to supplement our city budget. The average property pays slightly less than $400 per year. Unlike most cities in California, Piedmont receives virtually no sales tax revenue. Without Measure Y, cuts in essential city services will be unavoidable.

Measure Y is not a new tax; it RENEWS an existing tax. The citizens who served on both the Municipal Tax Review Committee (MTRC) and the Budget Advisory and Financial Planning Committee determined that renewal of the existing Municipal Services Tax is essential if Piedmont is to maintain its high standards of municipal services. The MTRC report stated: “ Parcel tax revenue has become an essential component of the City’s fiscal picture, totaling about $1.5 million annually in a general fund expenditure plan of about $21.5 million. Therefore, it will be essential to renew the parcel tax at its current level before it expires on June 30, 2013.”

All the money raised by Measure Y will stay here in our community to provide services and benefits to Piedmont’s residents. The Municipal Services Tax would not be necessary if the State of California was not taking approximately $1.6 million per year in property tax revenues from Piedmont. As a special tax, parcel tax revenue cannot be diverted by the State.

The City Council unanimously supports RENEWAL of the existing Municipal Services Tax, because Measure Y is essential for the maintenance of city services.

Please Vote YES ON MEASURE Y.

s/John Y. Chiang
Mayor

s/Valerie Matzger
Former Mayor

s/Bill Hosler
Chair, Budget Advisory and Financial Planning Committee

s/Mary M. Geong
Member, Budget Advisory and Financial Planning Committee

s/Steve Hollis
Member, Municipal Tax Review Committee
ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE Y

Short-term taxes don’t solve long-term problems. Thus, the majority of the Council-appointed Municipal Tax Review Committee (MTRC) opposes Measure Y.

In recent months, MTRC and the Council’s Budget Advisory Committee reported on the City’s long-term fiscal problems, determining that current trends are unsustainable. These revolve around over-spending and out-of-control budgets. The Council has so far ignored the most serious recommendations presented. Ill-advised spending continues its upward trend.

Among the worst examples which have led to millions of dollars of unneeded expense are:

• The Piedmont Hills undergrounding fiasco
• The aborted Blair Park plan
• Overstaffing
• Higher costs for service than in comparable small cities
• Uncontrolled employee benefit contributions

The last category has been rising at double-digit rates for years because the Council chose the richest pension plans in California without adequate analysis or appropriate employee cost-sharing. Thus, today Piedmont has a $40 million unfunded liability for these benefits – twice the size of the annual budget, a future obligation of $10,000 for every household in Piedmont and a risk to taxpayers and employees alike.

Rather than tackling these problems, the Council has used the parcel tax as a bail-out to paper over the lack of budgetary control. The parcel tax does not support critical services but simply gives the Council a way to avoid making hard decisions.

The majority of MTRC now says it’s time to stop the bail-out and force those decisions. The Council will have to set priorities and establish proper controls.

We are not opposed in principle to parcel taxes. If the Council takes needed actions to control costs, we will support one for essential purposes in the future. Today, however, the tax is not being used wisely or efficiently.

Insist on fiscal responsibility from the Council and vote No on Measure Y.

s/Ryan Gilbert
Member, Municipal Tax Review Committee
s/Tamra Hege
Member, Municipal Tax Review Committee
s/Eric Lindquist
Member, Municipal Tax Review Committee
s/Steve Weiner
Member, Municipal Tax Review Committee
s/Michael Rancer
Chair, Municipal Tax Review Committee

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE Y

The proponents are misrepresenting the MTRC position. The MTRC unanimously recognized that “passing the current parcel tax without addressing expense commitments is not fiscally prudent.” The MTRC supplemental statement delineated expectations for the Council to control expenses, manage risk and set budget priorities before seeking tax renewal. Because the Council has made inadequate progress on critical expectations, the MTRC majority opposes Measure Y.

Despite dangerously low reserves, the Council wasted millions on undergrounding, the pool takeover, Blair Park, and uncontrolled fringe benefits. Piedmont’s police and fire services cost 50-75% more per household than in comparable small, affluent cities. In the past two years, the MTRC, Budget Advisory Committee and Undergrounding Task Force have given the Council a road map to fiscal soundness, yet the Council still hasn’t acted on these groups’ most important recommendations. Piedmont’s voters must now force the issue by demonstrating they don’t support poor financial decisions and wasteful spending.

Scare tactics aside, essential services are NOT at stake. The parcel tax provides only 7% of the City’s budget. The Council can ask for the parcel tax renewal again, after instituting needed reforms and regaining our confidence, and seek service efficiencies now while phasing in benefit reforms. Piedmont cannot afford to let the Council “kick the can down the road.” If the Council continues to delay reforms, the possible consequences could be serious, including inability to meet obligations to our citizens and valued employees.

Put the brakes on the Council’s wasteful spending. Vote NO on Measure Y.

s/Michael Rancer
Chair, Municipal Tax Review Committee
s/Mary B. Heller
Member, Task Force on Undergrounding
s/Kathleen Quenneville
Member, Task Force on Undergrounding
s/Tim Rood
Member, Budget Advisory and Financial Planning Committee
s/Rick Schiller
Piedmont Taxpayer
REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST
MEASURE Y

For over three decades, Piedmont voters have supported
the Municipal Services parcel tax which provides essential
funding to maintain municipal services: police, fire, library
services, paramedics, recreation, street repair and mainte-
nance, and parks.

The opponents to Measure Y want to eliminate this criti-
cal source of funding because they are unhappy with the
way Piedmont is managed. They believe that the way to
get their way is to cut $1.6 million from our community
budget — money that even they have described as essen-
tial to the running of the city. The following quote is from
the Municipal Tax Review Committee:

“Parcel tax revenue has become an essential com-
ponent of the City’s fiscal picture. ...it will be es-
sential to renew the parcel tax at its current level
...”

Municipal Tax Review Committee Chair: Michael
Rancer

Measure Y is not a new tax — it just extends the current
tax. Without Measure Y Piedmont will face significant cuts
to city services. Countless meetings will be held and, in
the end, it is likely that service levels will be reduced or
the city will not set aside funds for replacement and repair
of assets.

This measure has nothing to do with undergrounding, play
fields or pensions. It is merely an extension of a tax we
have been paying for 32 years.

Vote YES on Measure Y because you value the services
our City provides to the community. Every dollar stays in
Piedmont to benefit all Piedmonters and the quality of life
we enjoy.

s/John Y. Chiang
   Mayor
s/Valerie Matzger
   Former Mayor
s/Bill Hosler
   Chair, Budget Advisory and Financial Planning
   Committee
s/Mary M. Geong
   Member, Budget Advisory and Financial Planning
   Committee
s/Steve Hollis
   Member, Municipal Tax Review Committee
FULL TEXT OF MEASURE Y
ORDINANCE NO. 707 N.S.
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 20B OF THE PIEDMONT CITY CODE PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL MUNICIPAL SERVICES TAX

The City Council of the City of Piedmont hereby ordains as follows:

SECTION 1

It is the intent of the City Council of the City of Piedmont in adopting this Ordinance to provide for the continuation of an excise tax, specifically a non-ad valorem parcel tax to be imposed as a special tax for the availability and provision of municipal services in Piedmont. Further, the availability and provision of City services and the demand for City services is closely tied to the uses and occupancies of property within the City, and it is logical to base such tax on use and occupancy of improved real property.

SECTION 2

Chapter 20B of the Piedmont City Code is hereby amended in its entirety to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 20B
MUNICIPAL SERVICES SPECIAL TAX

SECTION 20B.1 AUTHORITY TO ADOPT MEASURE

This Ordinance and the tax authorized herein is adopted pursuant to the provisions of Article 3.7 of Chapter 4 of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 5 of the Government Code (Sections 53720-53730) and the California Constitution Articles XI, Section 5, XIII A, Section 4 and XIII D, Section 3(a)(2). The tax authorized herein is based on use and occupancy of improved real property.

SECTION 20B.2 AUTHORIZATION TO LEVY SPECIAL MUNICIPAL TAX

If in any fiscal year commencing on or after July 1, 2013, the City Council shall determine that municipal services, including, but not limited to, police and fire protection, street maintenance, building regulations, library services, recreation, parks maintenance, planning and public works and similar services, are necessary for the public good, welfare and safety, and that the cost of making available such services will exceed the amount of funds generated through other revenue and income of the City for such services, then it may levy a special tax for such fiscal year on each parcel of real property within the City in a manner provided herein. This is a non-ad valorem parcel tax which, pursuant to California Constitution Article XIII D, Section 3, shall be deemed a special tax as defined pursuant to Section 53721 of the California Government Code.

SECTION 20B.3 DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT TO BE RAISED

Each year concurrent with the adoption of the annual budget, the City Council will determine the total amount of expenditures necessary to provide adequate levels of municipal services as defined in Section 20B.2 and deduct therefrom the projected revenue to be collected from sources other than this special tax. The difference, if any, shall be the maximum amount of funds to be derived from the tax authorized by this Ordinance for such year.

SECTION 20B.4 MAXIMUM TAX RATE/METHOD OF ASSESSMENT

After determining the amount of tax to be raised under Section 20B.3, the City Council shall apportion said amount among the parcels of real property within the City not exempted by law or exempted pursuant to Section 20B.12, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASIC MUNICIPAL SERVICES TAX MAXIMUM RATE SCHEDULE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Parcel According to Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 4,999 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 14,999 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 to 20,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Dwelling Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Parcel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The foregoing tax rate schedule shall apply for the 2013/2014 tax year commencing July 1, 2013, and ending on June 30, 2014. For each tax year thereafter commencing with the 2014/2015 tax year, the foregoing tax rate schedule shall be adjusted as follows:

An amount equal to the percentage increase or decrease in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for all Urban Consumers (All items) (Base Year 1984 = 100) (Not Seasonally Adjusted) for the San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, California area, as published by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, for the period from December 2012 to December of the fiscal year immediately prior to the year in which the percentage adjustment will apply, multiplied by the specific tax rate in the foregoing Maximum Municipal Services Tax Maximum Rate schedule. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the maximum percentage increase of this tax as compared to the same tax in the prior fiscal year shall be 4%.

For purposes of example only, if the maximum tax rate in the 2013/14 fiscal year for a single family resident parcel of 5,000 square feet is $399.00, and the Consumer Price Index for December 2012 is 100 and for December 2013 is 103, the increase of 3 is a 3% increase, meaning an additional maximum tax of $11.97 for the 2014/2015 fiscal year or a total maximum tax of $410.97 for such fiscal year.

The records of the Alameda County Assessor as of March 1 of the fiscal year immediately preceding the fiscal year in which the special taxes are payable shall determine whether or not any particular parcel is unimproved for purposes of this Ordinance. All improved parcels which are located entirely within the City of Piedmont shall be subject to the special taxes assessed pursuant to Chapter 20B. In addition, on improved parcels which are located partially within the City of Piedmont, all such parcels whose...
residents are eligible to register to vote in Piedmont and/or all such parcels which are eligible to receive services from the City of Piedmont pursuant to the 911 Emergency System as of March 1 of the fiscal year immediately preceding the fiscal year in which the special taxes are payable shall be subject to the special taxes assessed pursuant to Chapter 20B. Each parcel shall be taxed pursuant to this Section 20B.4 according to its actual use as of March 1 of the fiscal year immediately preceding the fiscal year in which any such special tax is payable.

**SECTION 20B.9 UNEXPENDED RESIDUE**

Unexpended residue of any money raised by the City under this Ordinance for a particular fiscal year, then the City Council shall use such residue in the next fiscal year for the purposes stated in this Ordinance or and to the extent there is an unexpended residue for the 2012-fiscal year ending June 30, 2013, such unexpended residue shall be returned to the taxpayer on the same pro rata basis as originally levied by a refund or by a reduction in subsequent taxes. “Unexpended residue” as used in this Section 20B.9 shall mean the amount the General Fund Reserve of the City exceeds twenty-five percent (25%) of the actual general operating expenses of the City in the fiscal year in question. “General Fund Reserve” as used in this Section 20B.9 is defined as the unencumbered balance maintained in the general fund for the purpose of meeting unforeseen expenses, unrealized revenue estimates, or other emergencies of the City.

**SECTION 20B.10 SEVERABILITY**

If any provision of this Ordinance or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect any other provisions or applications, and to this end the provisions this Ordinance are declared to be severable.

**SECTION 20B.11 DURATION, AMENDMENT OR REPEAL**

The authorization to levy a tax under this Ordinance shall expire with the fiscal year 2016-2017 ending June 30, 2017. This Ordinance, or any provision thereof, may only be amended or repealed by approval of a two-thirds majority of the voters voting on the proposition at any initiative or referendum election.

This Ordinance shall be adopted, if approved by a two-thirds majority of the voters voting on the proposition at an election to be held on Tuesday, November 6, 2012, and shall be effective commencing with the fiscal year that begins on July 1, 2013; provided that the provisions of Chapter 20B in effect on November 6, 2012 shall remain in effect for all purposes relating to the taxes provided thereunder through the fiscal year ending June 30, 2013.

**SECTION 20B.12 EXEMPTIONS**

The City Council may from time to time by Council resolution adopt exemptions to the tax measures set further herein.”

**SECTION 3**

This Ordinance shall require passage by a 4/5ths vote of the City Council in compliance with the provisions of Section 53724(b) of the California Government Code, shall be posted at City Hall after its second reading by the City Council for at least 30 days, and shall not become effective unless approved by a two-thirds majority of the voters voting on the proposition at an election to be held on Tuesday, November 6, 2012.
COUNTY COUNSEL’S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF
BOND MEASURE Z

ANALYSIS BY THE COUNTY COUNSEL OF A WASHING- 
INGTON TOWNSHIP HEALTH CARE DISTRICT 
BOND MEASURE

Measure Z, a Washington Township Health Care District (“District”) bond measure, seeks voter approval to authorize the District to issue and sell bonds of up to one hundred eighty-six million dollars ($186,000,000.00) in aggregate principal amount.

Pursuant to California Constitution Section 1 of Article XIIIA and California Health & Safety Code Section 32302, this measure will become effective upon the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the qualified electors voting on this measure.

Under the Ballot title/question, the proceeds will fund projects to expand emergency/intensive care units and other facilities, to provide medical technologies and facilities for treating heart disease, stroke, diabetes, cancer and other diseases, reduce overcrowding and wait times and to enable Washington Hospital to become a designated Trauma Center, shall Washington Township Health Care District issue $186,000,000 of bonds with an independent citizens’ oversight committee, annual audits, and no proceeds going towards administrative salaries?

s/DONNA R. ZIEGLER
County Counsel

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure Z, which is printed in full in this sample ballot pamphlet. If you desire an additional copy of the measure, please call the Elections Official’s office at (510) 272-6933 and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you. You may also access the full text of the measure on the Alameda County website at the following address: www.acgov.org/rov/.

WTMZ-1
TAX RATE STATEMENT FOR BOND MEASURE Z

EXHIBIT A FORM OF TAX RATE STATEMENT
TAX RATE STATEMENT IN CONNECTION WITH
WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP HEALTH CARE
DISTRICT BOND MEASURE TO BE SUBMITTED
AT BOND ELECTION TO BE HELD ON
NOVEMBER 6, 2012

An election will be held in the Washington Township
Health Care District (the “District”) on November 6,
2012, to authorize the sale of up to $186,000,000 in gen-
eral obligation bonds of the District to finance the acquis-
tion and improvement of real property for healthcare
related purposes. If such bonds are authorized and sold,
the principal thereof and interest thereon will be payable
from the proceeds of tax levies made upon the taxable
property in the District. The following information is
provided in compliance with Sections 9400-9404 of the
California Elections Code.

1. The best estimate of the tax which would be re-
quired to be levied to fund this bond issue during
the first fiscal year after the sale of the bonds,
based on estimated assessed valuations available
at the time of filing of this statement, is 1.310
cents per $100 ($13.10 per $100,000) of assessed
valuation in fiscal year 2016-17.

2. The best estimate of the highest tax rate which
would be required to be levied to fund this bond
issue, based on estimated assessed valuations av-
ailable at the time of filing of this statement, is
1.667 cents per $100 ($16.67 per $100,000) of as-
sessed valuation, in fiscal year 2044-45.

3. The best estimate of the average tax rate which
would be required to be levied to fund this bond
issue over all the years the bonds are expected to
be outstanding, based on estimated assessed valua-
tions available at the time of filing of this state-
ment, is .987 cents per $100 ($9.87 per $100,000)
of assessed valuation.

Attention of all voters is directed to the fact that the fore-
going information is based upon projections and esti-
mates only, which are not binding upon the District. The
actual tax rates and the years in which they will apply
may vary from those presently estimated, due to varia-
tions from these estimates in the timing of bond sales, the
amount of bonds sold at any given sale, actual assessed
valuations over the term of repayment of the bonds and
applicable interest rates. The actual times of sales of the
bonds and the amount sold at any given time will be
governed by the needs of the District and other factors
(including market variations in interest rates on general
obligation bonds). Actual future assessed valuations will
depend upon the amount and value of taxable property
within the District as determined in the assessment and
the equalization process.

Dated: August 8, 2012

s/Nancy Farber
Chief Executive Officer
Washington Township Health Care District

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF BOND MEASURE Z

Owned by the residents of Fremont, Union City, Newark,
Sunol and south Hayward, Washington Hospital has been
named Alameda County’s best hospital. As our com-

munity’s hospital, all profits are reinvested locally to provide
the best quality healthcare for our community.

Opened in 1958 to serve a community of 18,000 people,
Washington Hospital today serves over 320,000 residents.
Emergency Room facilities are severely overcrowded,
with over 50,000 visits per year. The existing Intensive
Care Unit is 45 years old and too small.

Measure Z will provide local residents access to the most
advanced treatments for heart disease, stroke, diabetes,
cancer, and other diseases.

Measure Z will:
• Provide local access to the latest advanced medical

technologies and treatments.
• Enable Washington Hospital to apply to become a desig-
nated Trauma Center to provide the highest level of emer-
gency care to patients.
• Reduce overcrowding and wait times by expanding
Emergency Room facilities.
• Upgrade and expand the aging Intensive and Critical
Care Units.
• Provide state required upgrades for earthquake safety.

Internal resources and private donations will pay for part
of the cost of hospital construction and projects. Measure
Z will cost homeowners on average about $35 per year and
is deductible on state and federal taxes.

Every penny from this measure must stay in our commu-
nity to complete the hospital. No funds can be taken away
by the State or be used for other purposes like administra-
tors’ salaries. An independent Citizens Oversight Commit-
tee will ensure funds are spent properly.

Local nurses, doctors, firefighters, police, and emergency
response providers urge support of Measure Z.

When you need emergency care, you need it fast. Seconds
can mean the difference between life and death. This mea-
sure will ensure rapid access to life-saving medical care
when you or your family needs it most.

Please vote YES on Measure Z.

s/Martha Ann Guilbeaux
ED Nurse & Fremont Resident for 37 Years

s/Brent Carl Hodson
Retired, Fremont Resident for 37 Years

s/Douglas Van Houten
Stroke Program Coordinator & Fremont Resident for 22
Years

s/David W. Smith
Former Mayor, City of Newark

s/William E. Dugoni, Jr.
Physician & Surgeon, Fremont Resident Since 1991

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST BOND MEASURE Z

WAS SUBMITTED
FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURE Z

To provide rapid, lifesaving emergency medical care to our local community by expanding Emergency/Intensive Care units and other facilities, provide the latest lifesaving medical technologies and facilities for treating heart disease, stroke, diabetes, cancer and other diseases, reduce overcrowding and wait times and to enable Washington Hospital to become a designated Trauma Center, shall Washington Township Health Care District issue $186,000,000 of bonds with an independent citizens’ oversight committee, annual audits, and no proceeds going towards administrative salaries?

BONDS-YES ___  BONDS-NO ___