Supports Crow for Council

Editor:

 Wanting to be an educated voter, I've read through candidate statements, fliers and websites. I've come to one conclusion: most candidates offer the same thing.

 All of them are for public safety, fiscal responsibility and quality of life. But, what do they offer new to San Leandro?

 Like it or not, police and city services cost money. The only candidate to present concrete proposals on how to pay for them is District 4 candidate Chris Crow (www.votechriscrow.com).

 He plans to fix the tax code so large retailers like Wal-Mart don't pay proportionally less in taxes than a locally-owned business. He'll also mend loopholes, like the one that exempts

airport parking lots from paying taxes.

 Unlike his opponents, Crow has maintained a consistent stance in favor of negotiating real pension reform. Let's be real, without it, this city will go broke.

 I'm voting for Chris Crow for District 4. I highly recommend you to do the same.

—**Nestor Cuellas**, *San Leandro*

Supports Daevu for Council

Editor:

 An extremely important election looms in Council District 4 in southeast San Leandro. After much thought and research, I will be casting my vote for Darlene Daevu, as my 1st choice.

 Ms. Daevu is a nine-year resident of San Leandro and is an established homeowner on Churchill Street in Washington Manor. She holds a Masters Degree in Business Administration and is experienced in business as well as public administration.

 She demonstrates the knowledge and ability to work cooperatively with the Mayor and Council members as well as the various homeowner associations, to move the City in the right direction toward financial solvency, and to create needed safety and improvements in our neighborhoods.

 We need her maturity and capability to represent the interests of District 4 home owners, industries and businesses at the City Council. Vote Daevu. She will prove to be your right choice.

—**Howard Kerr**, *San Leandro*

Supports Mack-Rose for Council

Editor:

 As a decade-long San Leandro resident, I am concerned about the financial challenges that face our city.

 We need a city council that embodies the vision and competence in leadership needed to move San Leandro forward. We need council members who are dedicated to overcoming the financial hurdles that are holding our city back.

 The Daily Review recently endorsed Morgan Mack-Rose for San Leandro City Council. I agree with that endorsement, because I believe that she understands the problems that we're facing.

 As a member of the School Board, Morgan supported green energy by fighting for solar for our schools, and brought nearly $200 million in new union-hired construction. She has also brought accountability programs for staff and administration.

 Morgan sees the potential of the High Speed Fiber Loop – something that will attract high-paying jobs and generate much needed revenue.

 She’s fought hard for project labor agreements, and is committed to fair negotiations to resolve our pension crisis – a position that has earned the endorsement of Labor, as well.

 We can’t continue to wait for opportunity to knock, we need active leaders to make it happen. A vote for Morgan is a vote for action. That’s why I’m voting for Morgan Mack-Rose on November 6th. I hope you do too.

—**Tyree Jackson**, *San Leandro*

Disagrees with Times’ Report Zoo Ballot Measure

Editor:

 I need to correct a couple of points made in Amy Sylvestri's article, *"Zoo Tax Ballot Measure Stirs Opposition," (The Times, Oct. 25, Page One)*
.

 Nothing whatsoever in the measure precludes the zoo from using tax money for expansion now or at *any* time in the future...*without limitation.* In fact, there is specific language in the measure enabling this.

 If Amy had actually read the full ballot measure, she'd see under section 1, chapter 2.30.010, paragraph H: "Services and Projects" include "without limitation... constructing, expanding, remodeling, renovating, furnishing, equipping, or financing of facilities...Financing the construction of new or renovation of existing Oakland Zoo capital facilities is within the definition of services and projects."

 Amy quotes CEO Parrott as saying that funds collected are specifically earmarked.

 Again, in the measure's Expenditure Plan: Expenditures Include: "Projects are not listed in priority order and may be enhanced, supplemented, or expanded..."

 "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...as long as...consistent with the general categories of projects listed in this expenditure plan."

So much for "earmarks." The zoo can do virtually anything the execs want with your money.

 The "citizens oversight committee" he cites is appointed by the zoo and political allies, not elected, and only has to meet once a year.

There is really no financial accountability to the taxpayers in the measure because the zoo's books are not open as are those of public agencies.

 Parrot is quoted as saying: "there is misinformation out there", but this is what the measure actually says.

—**Tyler Yarbrough**, *San Leandro*

Wants Council to Represent Residents, Not the Police

Editor:

 Though few San Leandro Police live in our city, the police department has been working hard to make sure that a few politicians get elected this fall.

 As you look at the lawn signs or the mailers declaring who the police support, ask yourself why it is so important to this special interest. They know which candidates will think of them first when contracts are being voted on.

 I want people on the City Council to represent us, the people of San Leandro.

 As you vote, think about whether the person you vote for will represent the best interests of our city, or the best interests of the police.

—**Mitch Huitema**, *San Leandro*

Calls Measure I 'A Must Pass' for Chabot College Students

Editor:

 For the first time in 50 years, Chabot College is in the untenable position of offering two Spring Class Schedules. Why? Because over the past three years State budget cuts have gutted more than $809 million from an already cash strapped community college system.

 Our "wait list" for classes at Chabot is 9,367 and 5,861 at Las Positas (a student is counted more than once if he/she is on multi-lists). This has a huge effect on students looking to transfer

to a four year university or continuing career training. Classroom space is at a premium.

 Measure I is a must pass for our students! Over $5 million was slashed from our funding by the State this year. Measure I, a $28-a-year flat educational parcel tax will restore much needed funds to our district.

 This is not new money, rather, it will greatly help students meet their educational goals and fills a huge hole which will help stabilize our
district.

 If Measure I does not pass, our district will not receive roughly $5.6 million per year for six years to provide classes and services to students. (The reason for the two class schedules.)

 If Measure I does pass, our district would receive roughly $5.6 million per year for six years effective July 1, 2013. This would enable us to provide our students with the classes and services they need to achieve their educational goals. Measure I is about students.

 Over the past 3 years nearly 5,000 students have received a degree or certificate through Chabot or Las Positas Colleges.

 Please join me in voting, “Yes” on Measure I so we may continue to educate students. They are our future and they deserve to succeed.

—**Isobel Dvorsky**

President, Board of Trustees

Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, *San Leandro*

Student Supports Prop. 34 to End the Death Penalty

Editor:

 My name is Morgan Yauger and I am an 11th grade student at San Leandro High School.

 For the November election, my class is doing a project. We were given a list of things that we could do and a list of propositions on the ballot for this November. I chose to write an editorial on Prop 34, which regards the death penalty in California.

 Proposition 34 is the “End the Death Penalty.” If Proposition 34 passes, the death penalty will become illegal in every county and city within California and it will be replaced with the option of being in prison for life.

 Without the budget being put toward the death penalty, the $100 million will be used to help solve more homicide and rape cases throughout California.

 Did you know that in this state alone, 725 people are on death row? If this proposition passes, their cases will be replaced with just life in prison without the option of parole. Even though they will still be imprisoned, they will be forced to find jobs within the system and the money that they make will go straight to the victims' families.

 There are many supporters of this proposition, including retired federal judge, H. Lee Sarokin. He says: "I've always said that I cannot envision that somebody contemplating murder sits at the kitchen table and says 'I'm not going to commit a murder because I could face the death penalty, but I will if I only face life imprisonment without parole.'" The California Democratic Party is also for this proposition.

 I feel that the idea of the prisoners having to work to earn money for their victims' families is a good idea because they have been forced to suffer the loss of a family member or a friend.

 I think that the death penalty should be terminated because it's taking up a lot of money that could be used for other important things, like solving more crimes. I feel that not being allowed to enjoy life in the outside world is enough punishment for the prisoner. I understand that there is a major reason that they are in prison, but killing them is taking away a lot of money from the government. So join California and vote Yes on Prop. 34 to save the state more money and make the prisoners work for the pain that they caused!

—**Morgan Yauger**, *San Leandro*

Wants a Crackdown on Dog Owners Who Don't 'Pick Up'

Editor:

 I applaud Mr. Randall Lai's letter *("Dog Owners Shirking Their 'Picking Up' Responsibilities," Letters, Oct. 25).*

 For the readers' attention, I quote an extract from the New Jersey Superior Court regarding the Pooper-Scooper laws: "Dog droppings have become a scourge, a form of environmental pollution no less dangerous and degrading than the poisons that we exude and dump into the air and water."

 I support that the City of San Leandro should pass an ordinance (if we do not have one) that requires dog owners to dispose of in a sanitary manner droppings deposited by their dog or they would face a fine. Don't let your dogs be a neighborhood nuisance.

—**Alfred Kwok**, *San Leandro*