 Election Rigging

by Andrea Rodriguez

The Berkeley Action Committee's so-called "majority rule" charter amendment is actually a thinly-disguised attempt to insure minority rule in Berkeley. The "non-radical" community, its minority status confirmed by the passage of rent control in June, is trying to rig future elections in order to keep itself in power.

Minority Rule

Money is the surface issue of the measure is noble. If candidates for city office fail to get at least 50% of the votes in municipal elections, a run-off will be held between the top vote-getters. What could be fairer or more democratic than that?

But it's not quite that simple. First, the amendment calls for city elections to be held "the third Tuesday in March," right in the middle of finals week at Cal. This is an obvious attempt to discourage student participation and give "non-radical" a chance to get majorities right away, eliminating the need for a run-off. If that doesn't work, the added expense of a more month of campaigning will work against the poorer, usually more radical candidates. The "non-radical" bloc, with its (comparatively) unlimited funds, will use this advantage to misinform and confuse voters, a tactic it has used many times before.

It comes as no surprise that BAC chose the end of March as the new election date. When students gained the right to vote in municipal elections, the radical majority was finally able to assert itself. The victory of rent control was the first real sign of this. Hill radicals, the more progressive half (at least) of the black community and white flatlanders all supported the measure and all were needed for it to win. But students, who provided almost half of the "yes" votes, were the decisive factor. The "non-radical," no longer able to merely ignore students, have come up with a unique way to try to disenfranchise them, and so cripple the radical movement in Berkeley.

If the first part of the election rigging is directed against students, the second is aimed at lower-income people.

One more month of campaigning would effectively eliminate independent non-rich candidates from Berkeley politics. For the Kalifornians and the Hones, these campaigns will present no real problem. They have ample funds of their own, and can count on support from other people who have money to throw away. A good example of this is the comic-opera budget negotiations.

Backroom Budget

City's Social Services Cut

One year ago, on August 31st, 1971, Councilman Wilmont Sweeney came to a Council meeting with a backroom budget. He had secretly made a deal with Mayor Warren Widener, and their budget passed with the (additional) votes of Councilmen McLaren, Price and Kaligren. The 1971 "Swedegate" budget outraged people by its failure to fund needed social programs and its failure to make additional cuts in the bloated police budget.

On August 31st, 1972, exactly one year later, Wilmont Sweeney came to the Council with a similar backroom budget. This time Councilwoman Susan Hone replaced Mayor Widener as the necessary fifth vote. Berkeley's 1972 backroom budget was the product of an amazing procedure.

Recent Meetings

For almost 12 hours over 2 days, the Mayor and up to 7 other members of the Council participated in a lengthy series of secret budget negotiations in the offices of the City Manager directly behind the Council chambers. The public Council meetings that had been scheduled were eliminated in favor of budget building behind locked doors.

This highly irregular procedure was initiated by Mayor Warren Widener. The Mayor stated that it was the only way 5 members of the Council could ever agree upon a budget. A public Council meeting at which a budget was put together with votes being taken in the opening could not have produced a budget, according to the Mayor.

At one time or another every member of the Council except Loni Hancock participated in the backroom negotiations. Councilwoman Hancock boycotted the secret sessions, spending several hours at her place in the Council chambers waiting for the scheduled public meeting to start. It was a long wait.

The public meeting finally started on the evening of August 31st, over 24 hours behind schedule. By that time a budget had been completed whose prime architect was Councilwoman Hone. Wilmont Sweeney made his budget motion with the confidence of a man who knew he had the required 5 votes, his own plus those of Councilmen McLaren, Price, Kaligren, and Councilwoman Hone. When Mayor Widener voted to appoint Susan Hone to the vacant Council seat, he made it possible for the conservatives to pass a budget without him.

The Sweeney-Hone budget package funded most city departments at the level of their expenditures during the last fiscal year. It provided for a 19 cent property tax increase, a sharp contrast to last year's 11 cent property tax reduction. But the backroom budget of fiscal year 1972-73 was most notable for what it did not include.

Health Care Sellout

The budget failed to provide adequate funding for the Berkeley Free Clinic, the Women's Health Collective, and the George Jackson Clinic. $37,500 was provided for the West Berkeley Health Clinic, but the other 3 free clinics were left to fight over the token sum of $18,500, far less than the $43,000 that those three clinics received from the Council last year. As a result of the new budget, services at these clinics will

Continues on page 10

RAPE OF THE MARINA

by Evie Wozniak

A $1,800,000 State loan resulted in the development of the Berkeley Marina into one of the "finest" Marinas in Northern California, and a $1,500,000 1971 amendment to that loan will make it the "largest and finest Marina in Northern California" according to its proud Supervisor. But what does the development mean to the people? It's one of the biggest rip-offs of public land and money that has occurred in Berkeley's history!

Before the 1965 Loan

Prior to the 1965 loan, development at the Berkeley Marina was simple and sparse. Unlocked piers (open to public enjoyment) along with a few small boats existed within the south and west walls of the uncongested harbor. There was a fire launching ramp for small boats under 20 ft. (not needing berthing). The small boats benefited from the relative protection of the harbor, as well as the Berkeley Yacht Club and the U.C. Sailing Club. Also at the Marina was the public fishing pier and two small simple low-cost restaurants (Dottie's and Moby Dick's). Though only sparsely developed in 1965, the Berkeley Marina still had the potential of future development benefit all to economic and social groups in the community.

The First Rip-Off Loan

The 1965 State loan of $1,800,000 to Berkeley was primarily for harbor improvement and berth construction (289 new locked berths in the east and north walls of the harbor), along with servicing facilities such as toilets and hot showers, lockers, parking lots, and a prize winning harbor administration. The primary expenses were to be the following: Basin Development, $467,200; Berthing, $423,690; Paving and Utilities, $456,600; Building, $208,700; and Landscaping, $46,950. This is how the loan resulted in a rip-off of public money and land:

1. The primary beneficiaries of its funds were a few unrepresentative people. The new berths benefited only 389 people, and the banana Marinas in all Alameda and Contra Costa Counties have boats large enough to need berthing. Only 25% have boats at all. Most people cannot afford boats.

2. Loan conditions divided the Marina into two parts: project area under loan jurisdiction and non-project area under City jurisdiction. The entire Marina land area came under loan jurisdiction with the exception of the fishing pier, the Berkeley Yacht Club and the anticipated South Sailing Basin and Marina Park. Loan conditions required the leasing out of "project area" land to concessionaires to help pay off the loan.
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EDITORIAL

As Grassroots keeps growing, we are now presenting ourselves as a serious and independent newspaper. We are now presenting ourselves as a serious and independent newspaper.

The following are some of the subjects that we will be covering in the future:

1. Community issues
2. Political issues
3. Economic issues
4. Social issues

In the meantime, if you have any comments or suggestions, please get in touch with us through our P.O. Box. And that's it for now.

MARIJUANA

Issue 4. Motion to endorse the California Marijuan Initiative. Hancock motion passed 5-1-1 (5 in favor - 1 opposed - 1 abstaining), March 28, 1972.

It was very easy for the City Council to endorse the principle of the California Marijuan Initiative that law enforcement should not interfere with people who use, use, or cultivate marijuana. It was quite another thing when a motion was made to instruct the Berkeley Police to put these principles into practice. The motion to implement the California Marijuan Initiative in Berkeley failed.

LABOR

Issue 6. Motion to prohibit Berkeley city employees from in any way acting as scabs during the U.C. labor dispute and from crossing picket lines to pick up garbage. Hancock motion passed 6-1, May 2, 1972.

During the U.C. labor dispute, Berkeley city employees were discovered crossing picket lines to pick up garbage. The motion was considered a victory by the unions.

Issue 7. Motion to rescind the previous action of May 2 (No. 6) and to order city employees to pick up garbage everywhere. Sweney motion passed 5-4, May 16, 1972.

The acting city attorney informed the Council, that, in his opinion, the city was legally obligated to pick up garbage for the University of California. The Council rejected a proposal by Loni Hancock that the City Council pass a motion to forbid that practice. Passage of this motion was considered necessary to ensure the safety of the students and faculty.

Issue 8. Motion that the City Council publicly discuss the issues of the city strike, rather than hold all discussion in executive session behind closed doors. Hancock motion died for lack of a second.

Recently, Super-Joel Tornabene, a well-known Berkeleyan was offered $500 a month by Stefan Zimmerman in work in the campaign.

The chart below shows how each councilperson voted on these critical issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councilperson</th>
<th>Issue 1</th>
<th>Issue 2</th>
<th>Issue 3</th>
<th>Issue 4</th>
<th>Issue 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrington</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweeney</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widener</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart below shows how each councilperson voted on these critical issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councilperson</th>
<th>Issue 1</th>
<th>Issue 2</th>
<th>Issue 3</th>
<th>Issue 4</th>
<th>Issue 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrington</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweeney</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widener</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY: Y = Yes; N = No; A = Abstain; BLANK = Absent; ? = No Position

Continues on page 3
McGovern and the Left: 3 Views

The discussion recorded in this article was held especially for Grassroots. Rick Brown is a long-time Berkeley activist and former April Coalition candidate in the 1971 City Council elections. Ying Kelley is a teacher for the Berkeley U.S.D. on leave of absence, works for American Reparations Committee, and was a McGovern delegate to the Democratic Convention. Joel Kotkin is a 19-years-old Acourt worker and campaign raiser for Contra Costa County. The subject of the discussion was: The Left and McGovern.

Photos by Louis Benaimous

Rick Brown: For the sake of the Vietnamese people it's very important that George McGovern win the presidency in November. I think the role of the left in the United States should be not simply to join the McGovern campaign but to organize independently of McGovern's campaign to continue to raise as we have for nearly a decade the important issues that the McGovern campaign is founded on.

It was not politicians who first raised the issue of the Vietnamese war. It was a mass movement that grew from a small beginning to a major antiwar effort and it's man action by people in the U.S. that will ultimately end the war. I think that McGovern will have to fulfill his promise of withdrawing troops from Southeast Asia and that McGovern will have to fulfill his promise of withdrawing troops from Southeast Asia and that McGovern's campaign is the first vehicle to further his political career. That's out front. I don't hold that against him. I feel very strongly about it.

I'm talking about pressing reasons for everyone to support McGovern. You may not be worried about the tax structure because it's not what you think is most important for yourself, but the civil liberties issue is very very clear. The Nixon Convention, for instance, was a very frightening thing. McClarcod didn't speak, they wouldn't let anyone speak. We don't think that could happen with McGovern. We must be very careful to mobilize them as an independent political force. He's talkzy about his ability to build a new kind of political machine that could see people were, what their concerns were and to translate that into an effective political organization that could win primaries. I don't think there's anything terribly wrong with that for a Democratic party politician who wants to become President...

Joel Kotkin: There's an issue in which McGovern is even more important than the war issue. It is this and this is another place where McGovern comes in— the civil liberties question and the Supreme Court. If Nixon is reelected, then we're going to get more anti-civil liberties justices. Also the press has been very restrained by the pressure Agnew has been placing on it, then there is the question of the environment. Basically, it's the relationship between the rights of property and the rights of individuals.

I'm talking about pressing reasons for everyone to support McGovern. You may not be worried about the tax structure because its not what you think is most important for you, but the civil liberties issue is very very clear. The Nixon Convention, for instance, was a very frightening thing. McClarcod couldn't speak, they wouldn't let anyone speak. We don't think that could happen with McGovern. We must be very careful to mobilize them as an independent political force. He's talkzy about his ability to build a new kind of political machine that could see people were, what their concerns were and to translate that into an effective political organization that could win primaries. I don't think there's anything terribly wrong with that for a Democratic party politician who wants to become President...
McGovern and the Left...

From page 3...

... I want to put my faith in the building of mass movements.

Vietnamese students...and we have gotten very positive responses. I have a fear of Hart and Mankiewicz, like a Kissinger and Nixon, as an example. I don't like Rasputin-like advisors.

I think, however, that each McGovern office has a style of its own, and here is where our strength comes from. HQ can tell us what they want: whether we carry through or not is something else, and the marvelous thing is that we have autonomy because we have a base. If we dislike something that the top does, we write a petition as we have done in the past—and we get a response.

There have been attempts to change the structure of the campaign in regard to local autonomy; like when we were told a month ago that we couldn't open our office in Berkeley until the county chairman had been appointed, and that we needed his signature on the lease and all kinds of approval from the top. We said: "Shit, we are going to go ahead and do our thing. We got the money, we got the manpower, if you don't like you can tell us to quit." We opened our office, and everything was just fine. Our power comes from the bottom, and not from the top.

I really think that this way we are really building a mass movement.

I wanted to mention what people could do both to aid McGovern and to help rebuild or build an independent movement at the same time. I think it's very fine that people who aren't involved in other political work are coming into the McGovern campaign, doing precinct work, going door to door, talking to people, doing voter registration. But people who have been involved in antiwar and other...
Grassroots Housing Supplement

People's Housing Council

Embracing all the diverse activities around rent control, housing rehabilitation and development, land use and zoning is the People's Housing Council, formed earlier this year to coordinate these manifold struggles and focus them in the political context of Berkeley.

Affiliated organizations include the Fair Rent Committee (which ran the successful campaign for the rent control initiative), the Tenant Action Project, the People's Housing Corporation group, the Ocean View Committee, the rehab-and-co-op group described elsewhere in this issue, People's Architecture, the North Berkeley Neighborhood Association, and numerous other issue or neighborhood organizations.

The Council, though, is no paper "coalition" of groups that pursue their own activities while lending their names to an umbrella letterhead. Rather, it's an information clearinghouse for land use activists and a coordinating body that tries to put diverse housing and land use questions together to achieve maximum impact in Berkeley. Virtually all of the activities reported in this supplement are part of the Housing Council.

This month several important

City Ignores Rent Freeze

by Nick Rabkin

When the Secretary of State signed the Berkeley rent control charter amendment into law, it began a freeze on all controlled rental property that will last until 90 days after the election of a board to administer the city's rents. The victory of that charter amendment in the June primary marked the end of the steady rent increases that Berkeley tenants have suffered since the end of WWII.

But it is a victory that will be snatched away if the city's tenants don't guard it jealously. Berkeley's landlords will not give up their enormous privileges and prerogatives without a fight. In the month since the rent freeze went into effect, dozens of landlords have raised rents on frozen units. B&G Properties is the maximum lawful rent (the frozen level, for now) may be subject to $200 in damages payable to the tenant, lawyer's fees and court costs. Such a provision might prove quite costly to a landlord if all his tenants were to make use of it.

Needless to say, though, the courts are not a tenant's best friend. At best they are a painfully slow remedy. At worst they are downright unfair. Many tenants who are currently looking for places will face landlords who simply won't let them move in without paying a rent increase. Recourse to litigation will not find these people homes. They will be forced, at least initially, to pay the increases.

What will happen if tenants refuse to pay illegal rent increases, or roll back rent increases after moving in? As of now the answer to this question is unclear. Landlords may try to evict tenants for non-payment, or may try to recover the increases through small claims court. In strictly legal terms, tenants are not required to pay illegal rent increases. But eviction defenses are time consuming and land use questions are coming forward. The fight to enforce the rent freeze and the campaign to elect members of the rent control board are just getting into high gear. The "invisible space" amendment and related zoning questions are being brought before the City Council. The Westbrae Community Action Group has won a preliminary round in its attempt to stand off high-density development, but the final decision remains to be made.

All these and more will be discussed and actions planned at the next People's Housing Council meeting. This affects everyone - tenants and homeowners, students and permanent residents. The Housing Council needs and deserves the active participation of everyone in the community.

For further information: Martha Nicheloff, 845-7967.

Housing and Land Use

--A GROWING BATTLE--

This special housing and land use supplement to Grassroots was inspired by the activities of the People's Housing Council. At the Housing Council's August meeting, reports were given on the continuing struggle to make rent control a reality; on the organizing going on around the Liveable Space amendment; on the People's Housing Corporation; on the co-op project to rehabilitate old structures; on the Westbrae fight to preserve a parcel of open space; on the Albany Hill super-development and the relief of Albany residents to halt it; and how these struggles are covered in these pages.

In addition, we've tried to analyze the history of land use and ownership in Berkeley, and to predict its future. We've talked to City Ignores Rent Freeze...

If You Receive a Rent Increase from Your Landlord:

1) Call the city manager - 644-6580
2) Call the city attorney - 644-6380
3) Call the Tenant Action Project - 843-6601

Continues on page 8
Livable Space Amendment

by Ken Hughes

Demolition permits would only be granted in the case of hazardous structures or to make possible construction that meets the "public interest" criteria outlined above.

Permanent Alternatives

This interim proposal, important as it is, is only a holding action to keep the developers from gobbling up Berkeley while the community writes its own land use plan for permanent adoption. This permanent plan--stage two in the subcommittee's strategy--is still unformulated, but various alternatives have been proposed. They are:

• Straight down-zoning of the whole city to R-2. While effective and clear-cut, this is seen as a very rigid structure that would call for frequent use of the variance procedure--leaving the way open for developers to continue as before, merely getting variances for each new project. Albany Hill was zoned below R-2, remember.

• Area zoning. This would create about 6 areas, each with about 20,000 people. A certain percentage of each area (say 125) would be devoted to higher density, 30% to medium density, etc. After the high density percentage limit has been reached all other parts of the area would be immune to further development. This proposal would leave present low-density areas open to considerable new development before percentage limits were reached, though, in high-density areas like South Campus it could halt further growth.

• "Present use" zoning. Apartment houses would be zoned R-5 and taxed as such. Single family homes--even if next door to a multi-unit structure--would be zoned R-1 and taxed as such. When structures run down and are demolished, the land reverts to lowest use, R-1. Variance for high density construction could be obtained only for fees set at confiscatory levels--thus effectively discouraging profit-minded developers.

• "Neighborhood zoning" would divide the city into 60 or so neighborhoods. Neighborhood councils would meet regularly to discuss new development plans and would have authority (subject to appeal to the Board of Adjustments) to grant or deny approval for new construction or demolition in the neighborhood.

Land use means more than housing and stores. It also means tot lots and playgrounds like the one above--enough of them so that parents and kids don't have to travel long distances to reach them.

Alex Forrester of People's Playgrounds (and an employee of the city Parks & Recreation Dept.) told us: "Every neighborhood that can get itself together to push for a lease or purchase of land -- or a street closing -- can create a tot lot or a playground." Biggest obstacles, according to Forrester: prying loose the needed money from the city, and actually finding available parcels of land.

One way to make more land available for tot lots is to adopt policies that will turn away developers eager to make profits from high-density construction.

For further information contact: Alex Forrester at the City Dept. of Parks & Recreation, 644-6530.

CHILDREN NEED PLAYGROUNDS

Continues on page 8
Housing Supplement

South Campus Land Use

The South Campus area provides a clear example of how developers and real estate interests, working alongside University officials and city politicians, can destroy a neighborhood without overtournng a single theft or breaking a single law.

Until the late 1950's, land use policy in the South Campus area was an arena of conflict between Berkeley city government and the University Regents. Postwar University expansion plans, calling for construction of student housing to accommodate at least 25% of the student population came head-on with land-owning interests which saw the tax base shrinking out from under them. In effect, every acre the University acquired was withdrawn from the city property tax rolls, leaving an increasingly heavy burden to be borne by private landowners. And efforts at city planning - Berkeley's first zoning ordinance wasn't passed until 1949 - were met with silence from University officials about their own plans for land acquisition.

Tentative plans for the People's Housing Council and its affiliates to elect members of the corporation, who will in turn elect directors. The purpose of the corporation - carefully spelled out in its corporate bylaws - will be to rehabilitate, develop, or assist in developing one of the non-profit basis for poor and working people, making loans or investments for this purpose. The bylaws also commit the corporation to non-racial, non-sexist operating principles - in sharp contrast to banks and other lending institutions which discriminate flagrantly against third world people and women. The corporation will, in fact, be expressly pledged to facilitate racial integration of neighborhoods and blocks. Key to the success of the corporation as a genuinely democratic organization is continued involvement of community groups with the Housing Council and Membership and directorships will be subject to annual review to prevent the rise of an entrenched "management bureaucracy" with only remote ties to real community organizations. But unless the Housing Council remains a vital, active group, the corporation risks dying on the vine - or turning itself into a top-heavy institution like Model Cities.

For further information, contact: Lee Cee, 843-4382.

Lee Cee is a member of the Peace and Freedom Party and Ocean View Committee

Photo by Louis Benainou
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One familiar housing story in Berkeley goes like this. A landlord, owning a fairly old house that's been divided into apartments, finds his taxes going up at the same time that land values in the neighborhood are climbing. For a few years, he hangs on to the property, increasing rents to match the rising property tax rates, and constantly working for higher property assessment values. The rising demand for Telegraph Avenue's small shoe-repair shops were forced to move by 1970, giving way to retail shoe stores merchandising fashionable, high-priced shoes.

Developers' Invasion After 1966, multi-unit housing construction grew sharply. Economic pressure and the University-City Hall pressure and the University-City Hall movement, the Vietnam Day Committee had done their work, small landlords sold out by the scores, opening speculative developers. Meanwhile land values in the area continued to climb, adding to the pressure on small landlords to sell out to speculative developers. Meanwhile land values in the area continued to climb, adding to the pressure on small landlords to sell out to speculative developers.

The South Campus area provides a clear example of how developers and real estate interests, working alongside University officials and city politicians, can destroy a neighborhood without overtournng a single theft or breaking a single law.

Until the late 1950's, land use policy in the South Campus area was an arena of conflict between Berkeley city government and the University Regents. Postwar University expansion plans, calling for construction of student housing to accommodate at least 25% of the student population came head-on with land-owning interests which saw the tax base shrinking out from under them. In effect, every acre the University acquired was withdrawn from the city property tax rolls, leaving an increasingly heavy burden to be borne by private landowners. And efforts at city planning - Berkeley's first zoning ordinance wasn't passed until 1949 - were met with silence from University officials about their own plans for land acquisition.

Tentative plans for the People's Housing Council and its affiliates to elect members of the corporation, who will in turn elect directors. The purpose of the corporation - carefully spelled out in its corporate bylaws - will be to rehabilitate, develop, or assist in developing one of the non-profit basis for poor and working people, making loans or investments for this purpose. The bylaws also commit the corporation to non-racial, non-sexist operating principles - in sharp contrast to banks and other lending institutions which discriminate flagrantly against third world people and women. The corporation will, in fact, be expressly pledged to facilitate racial integration of neighborhoods and blocks. Key to the success of the corporation as a genuinely democratic organization is continued involvement of community groups with the Housing Council and Membership and directorships will be subject to annual review to prevent the rise of an entrenched "management bureaucracy" with only remote ties to real community organizations. But unless the Housing Council remains a vital, active group, the corporation risks dying on the vine - or turning itself into a top-heavy institution like Model Cities.

For further information, contact: Lee Cee, 843-4382.

Lee Cee is a member of the Peace and Freedom Party and Ocean View Committee

REHAB & CO-OP

One familiar housing story in Berkeley goes like this. A landlord, owning a fairly old house that's been divided into apartments, finds his taxes going up at the same time that land values in the neighborhood are climbing. For a few years, he hangs on to the structure, neglecting maintenance, taking a tax write-off on depreciation, and occasionally raising rents to match the city-wide rent increases. Then he sells the load and structure to a developer. The developer immediately tears the old building down, gets a variance or zoning change, and puts up a jerry-built, multi-unit stick-on, which provides a steady stream of high rents and high profits for years to come.

One group affiliated with the People's Housing Council has come up with a strategy to stop this kind of housing speculation. The People's Housing Corporation, led by John Denton, and others have a plan whereby a private group would buy old structures, renovate, and sell them at no profit to tenants co-ops which would then become the actual owners of the housing.

One of the People's Housing Council is to see that public housing in Berkeley is really public - meaning owned and run by the people, principally those who need it.

A Berkeley Council subcommittee is drawing up papers for a Berkeley People's Housing Corporation, to be set up by the Housing Council and its affiliated organizations, who will elect members to run it.

The first hurdle is corporate law itself. It's not easy to organize a democratically run corporation when the usual corporate law is to destroy democracy and tighten elite control of land or capital.

Tentative plans call for the People's Housing Council and its affiliates to elect members of the corporation, who will in turn elect directors. The purpose of the corporation - carefully spelled out in its corporate bylaws - will be to rehabilitate, develop, or assist in developing housing on a non-profit basis for poor and working people, making loans or investments for this purpose. The bylaws also commit the corporation to non-racial, non-sexist operating principles - in sharp contrast to banks and other lending institutions which discriminate flagrantly against third world people and women. The corporation will, in fact, be expressly pledged to facilitate racial integration of neighborhoods and blocks. Key to the success of the corporation as a genuinely democratic organization is continued involvement of community groups with the Housing Council and Membership and directorships will be subject to annual review to prevent the rise of an entrenched "management bureaucracy" with only remote ties to real community organizations. But unless the Housing Council remains a vital, active group, the corporation risks dying on the vine - or turning itself into a top-heavy institution like Model Cities.

For further information, contact: Lee Cee, 843-4382.

Lee Cee is a member of the Peace and Freedom Party and Ocean View Committee
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Westbrae

including the threat to Codornices Creek and the need for open space. They further submitted a petition containing the signatures of an overwhelming majority of residents in the neighborhood opposed to the development.

Aside from the developers, no one spoke in favor of the project. The developers appeared to the City Council and on August 2 their dubious appeal was returned to the Board of Adjustments for further study. On August 31 the community was informed of the developers' decision to withdraw their original plans in favor of a new proposal not yet submitted.

This north Berkeley area with more than 900 children has long felt the need for recreational land since the closest park is one mile away. The City has finally acknowledged this need in its 1972 Parks Deficiency Report. The vacant natural area on Tevlin Street seems an ideal location for a park enhanced by the presence of Codornices Creek. A neighborhood committee has discussed the situation with the Director of the Parks and Recreation Department and is currently formulating plans for park development on the site.

Tricky Zoning

The Westbrae area is presently zoned R-2, a normally low-medium density, but was threatened by a section in the zoning ordinance which allows for builders to capitalize on contiguous lot acquisitions. Normally two dwelling units are allowed per 5000 sq. ft. but for each additional 2000 sq. ft. another unit is permissible. Thus what at first seems reasonably restrictive zoning becomes an incentive for speculative housing by profit-oriented developers who are able to subvert the intent of the zoning ordinance.

The community, realizing that the present zoning is not reflective of the single-family dwelling character of the neighborhood, began a drive to rezone the area within the Santa Fe Tracks, Hopkins Street, Acton Street and the city boundary. A petition signed by over 80% of the area's residents was submitted to the Planning Commission on August 3 and is now awaiting a vote necessary to initiate reclassification. The Planning Commission has scheduled a public hearing for September 20.

For further information, contact Stan or Veronika Fukson at 524-8336.

Yenan Books

2506 Haste St. Berkeley, Ca. 94704

“REVOLUTION IS THE MAIN TREND IN THE WORLD TODAY.”

POTTERY BUY WHERE IT’S MADE POTTER’S STUDIO 845-7471

POTTERS WHEELS

Pacifica Kick-wheels and kits. Complete with plans. Easy to assemble. Prices start at $45.00

CONTACT LENSES

Complete Services. Far-Out Metal Frames

Dr. Philip Schletter, O.D.

3031 Telegraph 849-2202
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**RENT FREEZE**

At its meeting on September 19, the City Council will decide on a date for the Rent Control Board Election. It will also consider a motion to instruct the City Attorney to enforce the law and pursue landlords who violate the freeze.

DEFEND THE FREEZE!!

SET THE DATE – JANUARY 23!!

Demonstrate at the City Council meeting September 19. Contact the Tenant Action Project (843-6601) for time, location and details.

Albany Hill Development

Pictured is the proposed Albany Hills Complex – 20 high-rise buildings bunched on 12 acres between the hill and the Eastshore Freeway (even at bottom of picture.) Not shown: the expected 5,750 residents; the additional 12,000 vehicles on surrounding streets; the massive impact on Albany schools, city services, and public life. Also not shown is the heavily polluted air residents of the proposed complex would have to breathe courtesy of the freeway at their doorstep. Rents, according to the developer, would range from $250 (for a studio) to $380 for a larger apartment.

This monstrosity very nearly slid through an acquiescent Albany City Council and Planning Commission hearing last month. Only community protest forced the Council to delay action pending further study. Next public hearings are scheduled for Sept. 11-12 amid strong indications the Council will try to ignore community organizations and let the developer write his own ticket.

Residents of Albany, El Cerrito and Berkeley all have a stake in stopping this development. For further information contact Catherine Webb of Friends of Albany Hill at 525-2115.

**REHAB & CO-OP**

In other words, while landlords still own their properties, the imposition of rent controls has taken away their power to drain unlimited rent from housing.

The rehab-and-co-op group is one mechanism for taking the next step – for the actual property owners to take over from landlords and transferring it to the tenants themselves, eliminating the profit structure that helps keep rents high. One "pilot" building is already under study for rehabilitation and co-oping. The present housing market indicates that more will become available in the coming months.

First priority is to make sure that rent control becomes effective; without it, real estate interests will soon realize that they can continue to do business as usual in Berkeley. In addition, tenants should begin now to form organizations in individual buildings that can plug into the rehab group's efforts, looking toward actual takeover of the buildings themselves.
the strike settlement
HOW GOOD WAS IT?
by Railroad Bill
Railroad Bill is a locomotive engineer and a nine-year member of United Transportation Union Local 31 (San Francisco).

Striking Berkeley employees represented by four unions returned to work at a new contract August 2. A month later, union members and officers gave Grassroots their comments about the settlement and prospects for the future.

Paul Varacalli, Executive Secretary of Public Employees' Local 390 representing fire workers among others-describes the new contract categorically as having "achieved a fair settlement but has not gone as far as people expected and then some." The one-year contract includes a $2.50-per-month "add-on" for refuse workers. Refuse workers also won a full agency shop (requiring non-members to pay dues equivalents for unit bargaining services), full binding arbitration, extended health benefits, and almost all other demands, including parental leave for both men and women workers.

The $2.50-add-on—first proposed by Caravalli—members Bailey and Simmons and widely viewed as a tactic to divide black men in the refusing unit from other workmen—was defended by Varacalli as "gravy" on top of the other gains won by the unions. But even some refuse workers were critical of this aspect of the contract.

Members of other striking unions also won almost 100% satisfied. Dave Aroner, Field Representative for Social Services Local 535, described the settlement as "one that will hold us for a year." Members of 535 got only a limited agency shop clause applicable to newly hired employees, according to Aroner, they'll renew the demand for full agency shop at contract time next year. As to the $2.50-add-on, said Aroner, "we feel that refuse workers deserved it but other inequities also need adjusting. Refuse collection is not the only city department that underpays minority workers." Bailey and Simmons had originally proposed the add-on as a way to right discriminatory pay scales of refuse workers, who are mostly black men. Somehow they managed to ignore the many black women in Local 535 who earn even less than refuse collectors.

Aroner also praised the role of the Ad Hoc Strike Support Committee in getting strike issues before the community and breaking the smokescreen imposed by the City Manager and negotiator Ray Smardon during the first days of the strike.

Pig Of The Year

Lea give was in the tomato sauce of refree workers fighting to get their fight recognition in the city, extended medical and dental benefits, and child care for employees. 2077 drew the most vicious attacks from the other unions. 2077 split off from the other unions and as a result, 2077 lost the support of the city's Black and White workers. But even some refuse workers were critical of this aspect of the contract.

One element in this pattern is community support of the kind the Ad Hoc Committee worked to mobilize. Berkeley union members who soon forgot that Lonzi Hanscomb defended the right to strike and supported their union rights demands, nor will they forget how other Council members tried every trick in the book to divide the workers and break the strike. The lines of communication between city union members and the political left must be kept open. Progress for Berkeley—in this area of personnel policy but also in the related fields of taxation and charter reform—must reflect the needs of the people who work for the city. Continued isolation of the left from city workers would be tragic; the possibilities of real concerted action are tremendous.

For Ecology Etc.
by Selina Benix

Vietnam Patrol Tactics

In an effort to defuse civilian resentment of the military, California marines have jumped on the ecology bandwagon and it’s going to be up to us to push them off if we don’t want their company. How many ecologists want to work with Marine Captain Dean Swickard who uses "Vietnam patrol tactics to keep track of the wildlife?" (Sunday ExcChron 8/27/77)

With the help of the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), the Sunday Excursioners, and other friends, the marine Camp Pendleton training base is being promoted as a "conservationist’s delight" and "the only substantial green space left between Los Angeles and San Diego."

What use do the marines have for over 300 acres of coastal wetlands which acts as a shelter for marine birds? The marines are fighting over the area. The lines of communication between city union members and the political left must be kept open. Progress for Berkeley—in this area of personnel policy but also in the related fields of taxation and charter reform—must reflect the needs of the people who work for the city. Continued isolation of the left from city workers would be tragic; the possibilities of real concerted action are tremendous.
probably have to be cut back.

The budget failed to provide any money for the Berkeley Emergency Food Project, based in the University Lutheran Church, has provided free dinners to many thousands of hungry people; its funded existence is now threatened by a lack of funds.

The budget failed to provide funds for the Berkeley Health Hut. This service, which provides a low cost place for people to stay, may now be forced to close.

Child Care Sellout

The budget cut by more than two-thirds the amount of money which had been set aside as matching funds for child care. There is now only $50,000 in the budget for child care rather than the anticipated $168,000. As a result many needy child care programs will not be funded.

The budget cut in half the amount of money Councilmembers will have for staff and expenses. This cut will penalize those Councilmembers who have an office budget but no staff and the two English-speaking Councilmembers who have no office at all.

The budget writers were able to find extra money for the Berkeley Redevelopment Agency and $20,000 for "business promotion" that was to be awarded to the Chamber of Commerce.

Some useful programs were included in the budget. $100,000 was set aside for the implementation of rent control, $56,000 for the administration of the new affirmative action hiring program, and $2,500 for upgrading the food prisoners receive at the Berkeley Jail.

As a consequence of the Sweeney-Hone budget was presented to a hostile crowd which consisted in large part of people from the many social programs being cut.

Hancock Loses Struggle

The crowd applauded efforts by Councilwoman Hancock to restore funds for child care, the health clinics, the youth hostel, the Berkeley Library, and other programs.

She made a motion to reduce the Fire Department of blatant featherbedding, she argued that the money could be saved without reducing services by eliminating 3 unnecessary assistant fire chiefs and by having civilian rather than firemen staff the alarm and dispatch center. The motion failed.

Loni Hancock then made a motion to fund the health clinics, the Berkeley Youth Hostel, the free food project, and to restore funds to the Berkeley Library. The money was to come from reductions in the Police Department budget. She argued that a police budget of 3.9 million dollars was excessive and that if the Council funded services such as health clinics, free food projects and youth hostels, it would be necessary to spend so much money policing people.

Ms. Hancock pointed out specific parts of the police budget that could be cut without reducing actual police services. She made the analogy between the need to reorder national priorities by cutting the defense budget and the need to reorder city priorities by cutting the massive police budget. The motion failed.

In another motion she proposed that the evening phone be put into the program for the old and feeble aged, and that the Department of Social Services be given the responsibility of putting them in touch with social agencies.

The budget writers were able to find extra money for the Berkeley Redevelopment Agency and $20,000 for "business promotion" that was to be awarded to the Chamber of Commerce.

Some useful programs were included in the budget. $100,000 was set aside for the implementation of rent control, $56,000 for the administration of the new affirmative action hiring program, and $2,500 for upgrading the food prisoners receive at the Berkeley Jail.

As a consequence of the Sweeney-Hone budget was presented to a hostile crowd which consisted in large part of people from the many social programs being cut.

- affirmative action

Early September one year ago the City Council was still struggling with a budget until an "affirmative action" employment program could be adopted. One year and many political battles later the City of Berkeley finally adopted a program.

What took so long and who played what role? The answer it not simple.

Who was the affirmative action program? As a matter of fact, there are so many factions. The major differences were whether to institute "affirmative action" at all, if so, how strong implementation and accountability should be, and to what extent women are discriminated against and whether as a group they should be included in affirmative hiring.

Representatives of Hancock, Widener, Bailey and Simmons exploded into the Chamber to register their anger at so many factions. The major differences were whether to institute "affirmative action" at all, if so, how strong implementation and accountability should be, and to what extent women are discriminated against and whether as a group they should be included in affirmative hiring.
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The Rape of the Marina

Today 70% of the Marina land is used for concessions (too costly for most people to use) and their servicing cement parking lots. Alternative types of development are no longer possible for this scarce waterfront land.

3. Profits from pre-existing berthing and concessions (as well as new berthing and concessions) within the loan's project area were required to be used toward the loan repayment. These profits belonged to City funds. A minimum of $150,000 of revenues are lost annually to Berkeley's General Fund in this manner.

4. The new berths built by the loan increased harbor congestion, forcing small boats out of the harbor. Berkeley became obligated to develop the less protected South Sailing Basin for small boats at the cost of several hundreds of thousands of City monies, along with the use of scarce non-project waterfront land. (Loan conditions negated the possibility of using loan funds outside the project area here or elsewhere.)

5. The loan contract obligated Berkeley to finance an additional ca. $2,000,000 (during the 25-year term of the loan) in services and facilities for the harbor project, such as replacement of existing roads with fancy four-laned ones, parking lots, sewerage system, administrative overhead services toward harbor operations and auxiliary departmental services to the harbor. These expenditures are categorized as "local contributions" and covered by several City funding sources including Capital Improvement Funds and Waterfront and Marina Development Fund. How much Berkeley has spent to meet its loan obligations is kept a secret by City bureaucrats who maintain an auditing technique of not differentiating between City expenditures in project and non-project areas.

6. Loan conditions determined that even if profits were generated in excess of that needed to meet loan payments, those revenues would not be available for public use. They could be used solely to pay the loan off faster.

7. The loan not only did not provide low and moderate cost boating opportunities, it put into jeopardy the one low-cost boating facility that did exist at the Marina. The Cal Sailing Club is open to a large segment of the public (all staff, students and alumnae of U.C. and their families). Since they charge low fees and are not University subsidized, they are unable to make the extensive capital improvements required by loan conditions. As a result, they are not allotted the special status given the Berkeley Yacht Club (an exclusive club with by-laws requiring 90% of its membership being boatowners). The Cal Sailing Club pays $4,000 rent yearly and the Berkeley Yacht Club only $1,000.

8. Loan conditions also put into jeopardy the two low-cost restaurants that stood at the Marina before the loan. Dottie's restaurant was razed to make room for a concrete parking lot. Moby Dick's (a simple tent which sells bait and sandwiches) has a precarious month to month lease as opposed to the 50 and 60 year leases granted the three new $7.00 a meal restaurants.

Unrequired Rip-Offs

The people have been ripped off even more extensively than required by the 1965 loan conditions due largely to decisions by Berkeley bureaucrats.

1. In 1965 it was anticipated that there would be far more recreational development for the public at the Marina than occurred, though not within the project areas of the loan nor financed from loan funds. The 1965 contract anticipated along with Marina development resulting from the loan which was called "Phase I," a more publicly oriented "Phase II" development:

a. "Phase II" was to include the purchase of 35 acres of land just South of the South Sailing Basin for public recreational uses such as parks, vistas and fishing areas. But Berkeley lacked funds to make this purchase.

b. "Phase II" development originally included development of vistas, fishing areas etc. on the peninsula on which His Lordships is now located. Originally that peninsula fell outside of the loan's jurisdiction and was to be developed for public recreational uses. But His Lordships became dissatisfied with all the site options within the loan's project area, and Berkeley renegotiated the loan with the State to accommodate His Lordships. Berkeley moorings also paid for the necessary landfill for His Lordships to locate there.

c. As a result of (a) and (b), "Phase II," the public phase of Marina development was limited to the South Sailing Basin for small boats, and the 2 1/2 acre swampy Marina Park.

7. The Park. The "first-class" restaurants included within the original master site plan were built but the two cafes were not. One of the cafes was eliminated in favor of the Marriott Inn which requested both the space allotted on the master site plan for a Motel and the adjacent cafe site. The Marriott Inn occupies eleven acres of Marina land with the right to expand even further. An office building called Akol Lee was recently constructed on the Marina. Like the Marriott Inn and new expensive restaurants, it does not meet community needs. It provides office space for a few firms and brings in only $2,000 annual revenue toward loan repayment.

Berkeley's City Attorney Robert Anderson recognized that both the existing and anticipated kinds of use of the building were probably in variance with the kinds legally allowable under the Tideland Trust Act. In a note to Berkeley's City Manager William Hanely February 26, 1971 he wrote: "Perhaps an office building was not appropriate in the first instance. However, that decision was made, and it would now appear that we will not be able to exercise the tight control over the use and occupancy of the individual office spaces as perhaps we should have done."

Continues on page 12

This is what is left for the public

His Lordship parking lot: Bureaucrats sell out

The Marriott Inn Motel: 11 acres of public land

Photos by Louis Benainious
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In the beginning of April to the end of the month, "H" moved city elections from June by a margin of over 26,000 votes. Proposition H, which was just passed, is insanity. Also, the plan would reverse the city’s tax burden. Berkeleyans have an incredibly high tax burden, and adding to it in order to pay for election rigging is an example of the democratic process changed to benefit the former champions of the city’s problems. They will continue paying lip-service to democracy as long as it works.

Andy Rodriguez is a local muckraker. From page 1...

EAST BAY WOMEN FOR PEACE
Garage Sale Sat. Sept. 16
2481 Webster St. Berk.
843-0879
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Marina Rape...
From page 11...

4. A contract renegotiation in 1966 allowed the Berkeley Yacht Club to expand into an area designated as within the loan’s project area. The State agreed to this expansion but it cost the City $1,000 a year. The $1,000 yearly rent paid by the BYC to Berkeley now had to go toward loan repayment. (The State also stipulated in the amendment to the contract that the BYC provide free public sailing lessons, a requirement which has gone unenforced by Berkeley bureaucrats).

5. Rates at the Berkeley Marina for berth and locker rental have not been raised since 1965. Though the Berkeley Marina is one of the finest in Northern California, Berkeley charges the lowest rates in the entire Bay Area. Berkeley charges 85 cents per linear foot while other first-rate Marinas charge $1.50 per linear foot. Ca. $150,000 yearly in revenue is lost in this manner (with Berkeley subsidizing boat-owners in such a manner, it isn’t surprising that two-thirds of the present users are non-Berkeley people). The State agreed to this omniscion as a result of a lack of funds. Today bureaucrats explain that the money was used instead for the public benefit within the project area. Whatever the real reason that the bureaucrats failed to live up to our legal obligations under the contract, the end result was in 1970, the State informally agreed to lift the Reserve Fund requirement on the condition that Berkeley apply for an additional loan for berth construction. (Part II next month: The Berkeley Marina Rip-Off of 1971)