OREB 2026 Endorsement Questions and Information

The first step to gaining endorsement from Our Revolution East Bay is completing the Endorsement Questions. Please answer **every** question; it is important to know your values. Most questions are Yes or No at the end of each section you may expand on any of your answers. Your explanation should be **CONCISE.** We may publish your answers to any question. **The purpose of the questionnaire is to ensure that endorsed candidates' values align with those of OREB. OREB continually monitors the actions of endorsed candidates regarding their questionnaire responses.**

If you have concerns or questions, please contact Carol Coyote and Michael Cheng.

Email *

kapriforce@gmail.com

Campaign Information

1. Name (as listed on the ballot): *

Kalimah Atreyu Priforce

2. Preferred Pronouns: *

He/Him

3. Position running for *

Emeryville City Council Member (incumbent)

4. Email *

vote@priforce.com

5. Phone number *

347-985-0365

6. Campaign website *

http://www.priforce.com

Core Values

1. Do you pledge to take no money from Super PACs? *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

2. Have you or will you accept contributions from AIPAC? *

- ( ) Yes
- (●) No

3. Have you or will you accept contributions from police unions?: *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

4. Have you or will you accept contributions from landlord/real estate developers? *

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No

5. Do you support the Fair Elections/Clean Money Proposition (SB42)? *

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

6. Do you support and will work for Universal Single payer Healthcare? *

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

7. Do you oppose genocide and military occupation? For example: Gaza? Venezuela? Ukraine? Cuba? Greenland? *

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

8. Do you support abolishing ICE? *

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

9. Do you support legislation to tax billionaires? *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

10. Optional: explanation of your responses to questions in this section (please be brief)

The Emeryville Police Department and I have built something real together: a relationship rooted in de-escalation, accountability, and respect for human dignity. I've also made sure EPD isn't used for anti-protest enforcement in surrounding jurisdictions. Crime has declined across several categories during my time in office, and I think progressives can say that policing can be humane and effective without treating that as a contradiction.

I don't take police union money, and I'm not interested in their institutional endorsement carrying more weight than this movement's. That's not a maybe, my commitments run through the movement first, full stop.

What actually matters to me is the officer who gives me a fist bump because they know I've tried to humanize them without ever giving up my obligation to hold their department accountable. That's enough.

Campaign finances and support (please be explicit)

1. Who contributed to your campaign? Other than individual donations, who have and who will you receive donations? List all groups, unions, businesses (especially those doing business with the entity in which you seek to hold office). *

As of today, no one has contributed to my campaign. I've spent this period focused on keeping Emeryville residents in their homes during the wave of evictions moving through the East Bay, not on raising money for my own reelection.

When I do fundraise, I want this campaign powered by working people: union support, genuinely small businesses (not firms pulling in millions while carrying a small staff), friends and family, Emeryville residents, and the people I've built relationships with through years in education, community organizing, and faith communities.

2. Which candidates will/have you endorse/d and/or contribute/d? *

I have endorsed Aisha Wahab, Robin Lopez, Moni Gangopadhyay, All DSA candidates including Nate Adams, and perhaps more who are on the socialist/far-left spectrum. I have one exception, and it's a values issues - I don't support YIMBYs and those who gentrify our communities. Fuck them.

3. Please list persons and organizations who have endorsed you. *

No one yet. I haven't tried. Give me to next week, when my legal casework has been dialed down.

4. Please list PACs, and independent expenditure committees supporting you. *

Nothing yet

5. List any/all industries, organizations and people that you will decline donations and endorsements from, * please be inclusive.

Real Estate (Gentrifying assholes), Big Oil (Toxic assholes), Big Pharma (Sick assholes), Animal Harming Industries (B*tch Ass assholes), Corporate Democrats (Goldman Sachs assholes), NIMBYs (Segregation assholes), YIMBYs (Trickle Down Hipster assholes), Transportation/YIMBY-aligned (Urban renewal assholes), Corrupt/Gestapo/Militarized Police (Remember George Floyd, assholes), AIPAC/Democratic Majority for Israel (Genocidal assholes), Crypto (Tech Bro assholes) and if you know of anymore assholes I can add to the list, please let me know.

Crime and Law Enforcement

1. What do you think about the use of force by police? What and when is appropriate and what and when is not? *

Oh hello no. It must be humane as possible. Everyone should be treated with dignity. If anything like that happens in Emeryville, even if someone is racially profiled - they come to me, I'll have them meet with the Captain and see what can be done."

2. Do you support banning private prisons? *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

3. Do you support installing surveillance cameras such as FLOCK, which stores individual information, at public areas? *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

4. Do you oppose capital punishment? *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

5. Should convicted felons and prison in-mates be granted the right to vote? *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

6. Do you believe it is ever warranted to suspend due process? *

- ( ) Yes
- (●) No

7. Optional: explanation of your responses to questions in this section (please be concise)

Yes, but this is the most complicated "yes" on this questionnaire.

I am deeply skeptical of surveillance technology, and recent abuses of Flock prove why. Police officers have been arrested for using the system to track people for personal reasons, and a Texas sheriff's office used Flock's nationwide network to investigate a woman who had self-managed an abortion. Those abuses are horrifying, and they strengthen my belief that ALPR technology requires aggressive democratic oversight.

So why did a democratic socialist support bringing Flock to Emeryville? The working class.

Emeryville was in the middle of a serious escalation in violent and property crime when I ran for office and in the months after I was sworn in. A double shooting in a multifamily building left blood through the hallways and stairs. Emeryville experienced its first homicide in years at 41st Street and San Pablo Avenue. Organized theft and vehicle-related crime were also surging, while people committing crimes in surrounding cities could move through Emeryville and quickly reach nearby freeways.

At the same time, surveillance and security already existed here, just privately. Condominium communities, commercial properties, and wealthier residents could buy cameras, controlled-access garages, security personnel, secure parking, and other protections. Renters and working-class residents largely could not. I am a lifelong renter myself, and I was not willing to accept a system where safety became another amenity available mainly to people who could afford it.

So I supported a limited network of 16 city ALPR cameras, and I also proposed civilian oversight over how that system gets used. I won the first fight. I have not yet won the second. Emeryville's system has a 30-day retention policy, requires justification for every search, keeps an audit trail, and follows California's restrictions on sharing ALPR data. I want those protections strengthened further, especially against access by ICE or any agency trying to criminalize conduct protected under California law, and I have begun working with Faith in Action to strengthen Emeryville's sanctuary protections against that kind of surveillance.

I do not love Flock. I would rather see an interoperable public or open-source alternative that does not concentrate this much surveillance power in one private company. But public safety cannot become a luxury good either. Sometimes governing means holding two real values in tension instead of pretending one of them does not exist. I made that choice. I am accountable for it. And I will keep fighting for real civilian control over the technology we use.

Human Rights, Immigration, and Civil Rights

1. Do you support DACA? *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

2. Do you support closing immigration detention facilities? *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

3. Do you support increased funding for immigration assistance? *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

4. Should immigrants without felonies be given a path to citizenship? *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

5. Do you support DEI? (Diversity, Equity and Inclusion) *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

6. Do you support reparations? *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

7. Optional: explanation of your responses to questions in this section (please be concise)

Infrastructure Issues

1. Do you support public banking? *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

2. Do you think public transit should be free? *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

3. Optional: explanation of your responses to questions in this section (please be concise)

Current Labor Issues

1. Do you support a California “living wage”? How? *

Yes. A California minimum wage should be a living wage. In one of the most expensive states in America, someone working full time should be able to pay rent, buy food, care for their family, and live with dignity. I support raising the statewide floor, automatically indexing it to the cost of living, aggressively enforcing wage theft laws, and preserving the right of cities like Emeryville to go higher when local costs demand it.

Emeryville has already lived this fight. In 2019, our minimum wage was scheduled to rise to $16.30 for every worker, at the time the highest minimum wage in the country. Councilmembers John Bauters, Dianne Martinez, and Scott Donahue voted to create a restaurant carveout that would have kept some workers at $15 and slowed their path to the full wage. Labor fought back.

SEIU 1021, EBASE, the Alameda Labor Council, East Bay Working Families, RULE, ACCE, ROC United, workers, and community organizers took the issue directly to Emeryville voters. They needed 666 valid signatures to challenge the change. They collected 871. The pressure worked, the carveout was repealed, and workers received the wage they had already been promised.

Today Emeryville's minimum wage is $20.34 an hour. That history taught me something important: a living wage does not survive because politicians call themselves progressive. It survives because working people organize and hold us accountable. California should establish a stronger living wage floor, let communities raise it further, and never balance the survival of a business on the backs of the workers who make that business possible.

2. List 3 ideas to reduce the price of shelter in your community? *

First, take housing off the speculative market through public and social ownership. Emeryville already has tools for this: Measure C bond funding, public land, and partnerships with community land trusts and limited-equity co-ops. When the public or a nonprofit owns the housing instead of a landlord or a private equity fund, the price stops being set by what the market will bear and starts being set by what people can actually afford. That is a permanent fix, not a temporary subsidy.

Second, stop the price gouging that happens to people who already have a home. Rent stabilization, real just-cause eviction protections, and aggressive enforcement against illegal rent hikes and harassment protect the cheapest housing that exists anywhere: the unit someone is already living in. Every eviction from an affordable unit is a de facto rent increase the moment that unit gets re-rented at market rate. You cannot build your way out of displacement. You have to stop it from happening.

Third, go after the landlords and algorithms colluding to fix prices, not just the supply. Companies like RealPage let landlords across an entire region secretly coordinate rent increases through shared pricing software, functioning like a cartel with a rent instead of a smokestack. California cities should ban algorithmic rent-setting tools for landlords and push the state to investigate coordinated pricing in our own rental markets. This is not a housing shortage problem. It is a price-fixing problem, and it needs an antitrust answer, not a permitting answer.

None of these three ideas require betting on a developer's promise that affordability will eventually trickle down from more market-rate supply. They all do the same thing from a different angle: they take pricing power away from whoever profits from housing being expensive, and they put it in the hands of the people who actually live here.

3. What do you propose to protect renters in your community? Please comment on laws/acts, such as Costa Hawkins and others, to be repealed, and added/legislated? *

At the state and national level, I want housing policy to do more than manage renter insecurity. It should change who holds power over housing.

Costa-Hawkins should be repealed so California communities can adopt stronger rent stabilization, including limits on vacancy-driven rent resets. The Ellis Act should be repealed or sharply narrowed so it cannot be used as a speculative eviction strategy. AB 1482 should be strengthened and made permanent, with a lower rent ceiling, fewer exemptions, stronger enforcement, and protection for cities that choose to go further.

Tenants also need collective power. I support a tenants' bill of rights that protects organizing, requires good cause for eviction, strengthens anti-retaliation protections, expands access to counsel, and gives tenant associations a meaningful role in disputes with large landlords.

I also support giving tenants, community land trusts, nonprofits, and public entities a first opportunity to purchase rental properties when they are sold. Washington, D.C.'s tenant-purchase model and San Francisco's community-purchase model show how housing can be preserved before it is lost to speculation. Public investment should expand social housing, limited-equity cooperatives, community land trusts, and permanently affordable nonprofit or public ownership.

Corporate landlords should not be regulated as though they are the same as a homeowner renting an ADU or former family home. Basic tenant rights should apply to everyone, but large institutional landlords should face stronger disclosure, registration, fee-transparency, eviction-reporting, and enforcement requirements. Small homeowners can receive technical assistance and simpler compliance while still respecting tenant protections.

I also support strong action against algorithmic rent-setting and coordinated pricing systems that increase the market power of large landlords.

My goal is a housing system where renters can organize, communities can preserve housing before it is lost to speculation, public dollars create permanent affordability, and corporate landlords cannot use their scale to dictate the terms of housing for everyone else.

Housing should be treated first as a home, not primarily as a financial instrument.

4. Do you support the repeal of all laws that criminalize or punish homeless people? *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

How do we provide/develop more affordable and low-cost housing? In your community and in California? *

In Emeryville, I am building a comprehensive tenant bill of rights around a simple principle: renters should know what their housing actually costs, have meaningful due process before losing it, and be able to organize collectively when a landlord has far more economic power than any individual tenant.

My priority is an affirmative right to organize. Tenants should be able to form building associations, knock on their neighbors' doors, distribute information, meet in common areas, invite organizers and attorneys onto the property, and act collectively in dealings with management without surveillance, intimidation, selective enforcement, or retaliation. I want those rights written into local law with meaningful remedies when landlords interfere with them.

I also want Emeryville to regulate the growing collection of fees that function as rent without being called rent. That includes parking charges, technology fees, package fees, amenity charges, administrative fees, utility billing fees, and other mandatory add-ons. Landlords should disclose the complete monthly cost of a tenancy before a lease is signed, and mandatory charges in BMR housing should count toward the affordability calculation.

I am particularly interested in regulating Ratio Utility Billing Systems, or RUBS. Under RUBS, tenants can be charged for utilities based on formulas such as occupancy or unit size rather than their actual consumption. That can force renters to pay for building-wide water loss, common-area usage, or inefficiencies they do not control. Nearby Alameda banned RUBS for new tenancies in rent-stabilized units in 2026. Emeryville should move in the same direction by requiring separate metering where feasible, prohibiting landlords from profiting from utility pass-throughs, requiring tenants to have access to the underlying master bill and calculation method, and treating unavoidable utility charges as part of the true regulated housing cost rather than an open-ended surcharge.

Our BMR program also needs due process. A qualified tenant should not lose affordable housing because of a confusing deadline, missing document, disability, medical emergency, or unilateral decision by a private property manager. I support simplified recertification, longer notice periods, written deficiency notices, meaningful opportunities to cure, reasonable accommodations, an appeal process, and City review before affordable status can be terminated.

Emeryville should also establish a meaningful rental registry. Oakland already requires covered landlords to register rent and tenancy information annually, and landlords who fail to register can lose the ability to impose rent increases or pursue certain remedies until they comply. A registry would give Emeryville the information it needs to see what tenants are actually paying, where displacement is occurring, which landlords are repeatedly violating local law, and whether rent increases and fees comply with City requirements.

I would pair that with stronger just-cause protections, anti-harassment rules, relocation assistance, a genuine right to return after displacement for repairs, and access to counsel for tenants facing eviction. New York City has already demonstrated that a city can make eviction counsel available citywide rather than treating legal representation as something only landlords can reliably afford.

I also believe our laws should recognize that a homeowner renting one unit is not economically identical to a multinational or private-equity-backed landlord controlling hundreds or thousands of homes. Basic tenant rights such as habitability, freedom from retaliation, fair notice, and protection against unlawful eviction should apply regardless of who owns the property. But regulatory burdens can be graduated. A genuine owner-occupant or small homeowner could receive simpler registration, technical assistance, low-cost rehabilitation support, and help complying with changing rules. Corporate and large-portfolio landlords should face stronger disclosure, reporting, local-agent, recordkeeping, fee-transparency, and enforcement requirements because they have professional management systems and far greater market power.

The point is not to treat every person who rents out a home as the same kind of landlord. The point is to protect every tenant while concentrating the strongest regulatory scrutiny where ownership and market power are most concentrated.

Rights without enforcement are paper shields. I support statutory damages, attorney-fee recovery, City enforcement authority, multilingual notices, public reporting, and penalties large enough that violating tenant law is never simply cheaper than obeying it.

Education (How do we provide affordable and quality education and childcare?)

1. Do you support charter schools? *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

2. Should charter schools be at no cost and unionized? Please use examples in your community.

I support public charter schools when they genuinely serve a public purpose. I do not support charter schools as a back door to privatization, union-busting, real-estate speculation, or the dismantling of neighborhood public schools.

That distinction matters because charter schools are legally public schools. They are publicly funded, tuition-free, and publicly authorized in exchange for greater autonomy and accountability. So I think the more useful question is not simply, “charter or traditional public school?” It is: Who governs the school? Who profits from it? Where does the public money go? Do teachers and families have meaningful power? Does the school serve students with disabilities and English learners fairly? Does it strengthen educational opportunity in the surrounding community, or weaken the public system around it?

There is an important distinction between nonprofit Charter Management Organizations and for-profit Education Management Organizations. A nonprofit, community-accountable charter can still be part of public education. A model that turns the management of a publicly funded school over to a for-profit company creates a very different set of incentives. I oppose arrangements where public education dollars are converted into private profit through management fees, opaque contracts, related-party transactions, or other structures that weaken democratic accountability.

I am also unwilling to dismiss public charter schools that have demonstrably expanded opportunity for Black and Brown children simply because they carry the word “charter.”

Geoffrey Canada’s Harlem Children’s Zone Promise Academy is an important example. Promise Academy was a public charter school embedded within a much larger cradle-to-career community strategy in Harlem. Rigorous lottery-based research found substantial academic gains for low-income Black and Latino students, including effects large enough to close the Black-white mathematics achievement gap for middle-school students and substantially narrow the gap in English language arts. Later research also found increased college enrollment among students offered admission.

That history matters. Black and Brown communities have sometimes spent generations inside school systems that everybody knew were failing their children. I do not believe it is progressive to tell those families that preserving an institution matters more than whether their children can read, do mathematics, graduate, enter college, and realize their potential. A public education movement has to defend children as fiercely as it defends systems.

At the same time, I do not believe every successful charter model should be replicated wholesale. KIPP illustrates why this debate requires nuance rather than slogans. KIPP schools are public charter schools operated through a nonprofit network, and independent research has documented significant academic and college-going outcomes. I will not erase those results because they complicate an ideological argument.

But the historically associated “No Excuses” model also relied heavily on rigid behavioral expectations, strict discipline, extended instructional time, and top-down systems of control. My concern has never been with high expectations. Black children deserve extraordinarily high expectations. My concern is with confusing high expectations with authoritarianism. Academic rigor should develop voice, agency, intellectual confidence, and leadership, not teach Black and Brown children that obedience is the price of opportunity.

Dr. Lorraine Monroe showed me that distinction personally.

Dr. Monroe transformed Frederick Douglass Academy in Harlem through rigorous academics, structure, culture, mentorship, and an uncompromising belief in the intellectual capacity of Black and Brown children. Frederick Douglass Academy was a traditional district public school, not a charter school. That matters because it demonstrates that charter status itself is not the magic ingredient.

Leadership matters. Culture matters. Instructional time matters. Mentorship matters. Expectations matter. Community

matters.

And this is personal for me. Dr. Lorraine Monroe discovered and mentored me when I was a trouble-making teenager in Harlem. Her influence shaped the way I came to understand education, leadership, and the responsibility to see possibility in young people before they can necessarily see it in themselves.

My own work with Qeyno Labs grew from that same philosophy. Qeyno was built to close the STEM opportunity gap by connecting underserved young people with technology, mentors, entrepreneurship, design, and inclusive hackathons. The work was ultimately recognized by the Obama White House because we refused to treat underserved youth as deficits waiting to be repaired. We treated their experiences, imagination, culture, and curiosity as assets from which innovation could begin.

My graduate work in Education Entrepreneurship at the University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education has brought me back to that mission. The program's capstone is built around identifying an opportunity for educational innovation and developing a real program, service, or venture around it.

For me, that creates an opportunity to bring Qeyno Labs back in a new form: as a Saturday school.

There is a long international tradition of supplementary education, but it teaches us two very different lessons.

Japan's juku system demonstrates how families use additional instructional time outside the normal school day to strengthen academic preparation. But it also illustrates the danger of allowing supplementary education to become another commodity purchased primarily by families who can afford it. If additional educational time improves opportunity, access to that time should not depend on parental wealth.

The Black Saturday-school tradition in Britain offers an even more powerful model for what I have in mind. Beginning in the 1970s, Black parents and community organizers created supplementary schools in response to a British education system that was systematically failing and misclassifying children of Caribbean heritage. Those communities did not wait for the institution that had failed their children to rescue them. They built educational infrastructure themselves.

That is an extraordinary tradition of community self-determination.

We have American versions of that idea as well. Saturday and supplementary programs have brought young people together with scientists, engineers, artists, mentors, cultural educators, and community leaders outside the constraints of the traditional school day. The best versions are not simply test-preparation programs. They create spaces for intellectual exploration, identity, mentorship, leadership, and belonging.

My conclusion is not that America needs a larger private tutoring industry.

It is almost the opposite.

What wealthy families routinely purchase for their children after school, during summers, and on weekends should become part of the educational commons available to every child.

That is what I envision for the Lorraine Monroe School, a Priforce Academy.

It would not be another private school competing with public education. It would not exist to drain enrollment or resources from neighborhood schools. It would be a Saturday learning institution designed to strengthen the young people who attend those schools.

I envision combining Qeyno's project-based technology and innovation work with rigorous literacy and mathematics, artificial intelligence and computer science, civic education, entrepreneurship, arts, mentorship, leadership, cultural

history, and the kind of intellectual confidence that Dr. Monroe demanded from generations of Black and Brown children.

And I would want it to function as a laboratory for public education rather than an escape hatch from it.

If something works on Saturday, bring it back into Monday.

So yes, I support public charter schools when they are genuinely public, transparent, accountable, community-rooted, educationally successful, accessible to the students they claim to serve, and designed to expand opportunity rather than extract public resources for private gain.

I oppose for-profit management of public schools, opaque governance, selective practices that leave traditional public schools carrying disproportionate concentrations of high-need students, union-busting, profiteering from public education dollars, and charter expansion whose underlying purpose is privatization rather than education.

But I also reject the idea that defending public education requires defending every existing arrangement regardless of whether children are thriving inside it.

My standard is public money, public accountability, community power, excellent educators, high expectations, measurable educational opportunity, and children who leave school knowing that their future belongs to them.

I am not interested in choosing between public schools and Black and Brown children.

Our obligation is to build public education worthy of them.

I hope y'all can see the theme on this questionnaire of my work.

3. Do you support no cost public college and university? *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

4. Do you support the cancellation of all student debt? *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

5. Do you support free universal public pre-K? *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

6. Do you support free universal childcare for children under 5? *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

7. Do you support “strengthening” Title IX including trans rights? *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

8. Optional: explanation of your responses to questions in this section (please be concise) *

N/A

Environmental

1. How will you work to uphold environmental regulations in the face of the government's attempt to eradicate? Include and use example from your community. *

As an incumbent councilmember in Emeryville, I have treated environmental protection as a core responsibility of local government, especially as federal protections are weakened. I support using every available local, regional, and state tool to protect residents from pollution, toxic exposure, flooding, climate risk, and development that shifts environmental costs onto the public.

I also support strengthening CEQA, not weakening it for politically favored projects. CEQA gives communities a critical opportunity to examine air pollution, contaminated land, traffic, water use, noise, displacement, and cumulative environmental impacts before damage becomes irreversible.

In Emeryville, that work has to reflect our real history and geography. We are a dense city shaped by former industrial uses, contaminated sites, freeways, shoreline vulnerability, and intense development pressure. Environmental policy cannot be reduced to eliminating cars or adding bike lanes that many seniors, people with disabilities, caregivers, tradespeople, and working families cannot realistically use. I support transportation choices, not a one-size-fits-all ideology.

The Emeryville Crescent is a strong example of the kind of environmental policy I support. Our shoreline adaptation work should prioritize habitat restoration, living shorelines, flood resilience, and natural systems as we prepare for sea-level rise.

As federal environmental enforcement retreats, I have supported making California and local protections stronger. Environmental regulation is not bureaucratic red tape. It is how government prevents private profit from becoming the public's pollution, flooding, toxic exposure, and climate risk.

2. What do you think is the most critical environmental issue? In your community? *

The most critical emerging environmental issue I see for Emeryville and California is the rapid growth of large data centers, particularly those supporting artificial intelligence.

I come from the technology sector, so my concern is not anti-technology. It is about accountability. AI-scale data centers can consume enormous amounts of electricity and water, require major grid upgrades and backup generation, and create industrial-scale environmental impacts while employing relatively few people once construction is complete.

I do not believe working families should subsidize new electrical infrastructure primarily needed by some of the wealthiest corporations in the world. Data-center operators should pay the true costs they create, disclose their electricity and water consumption, minimize potable-water use, and meet strong standards for backup-power emissions, noise, waste heat, and e-waste.

This is also why I support strengthening CEQA. Large technology projects should not receive special exemptions or weakened environmental review simply because AI is economically fashionable. If a facility consumes resources on the scale of an industrial plant, it should receive industrial-scale environmental scrutiny.

I believe innovation and environmental accountability can coexist. Technology companies should innovate, but they should also pay their own environmental bill.

3. Do you support community and government oversight in the approval of and the construction of data centers for corporations? *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

Election

1. Do you support the Constitutional amendment to repeal Citizens United? *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

2. Will you uphold the Voting Rights Act? *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

3. Do you support universal mail-in ballots? (such as was used for Prop 50) *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

4. Optional: explanation of your responses to questions in this section (please be concise)

US Foreign Policy – National Issues Affect Local Positions

1. Do you support the international campaign of BDS (Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions)? *

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

2. What should the US policy be on Palestine/Israel? *

Babies before bombs.

3. Do you agree with the current economic sanctions? *

No

4. What are your views on the tariff policy?

Stop offloading tariff costs to the people.

Anything Else?

1. Thanks for your time and thoughtfulness. Is there anything else we should know? *

See y'all later today!

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms