

GRANICK SLATE CARD
GENERAL ELECTION: NOVEMBER 7, 2006

Friends, Romans, Countrymen:

This mid-term general election could be one of the most important Ever for the Democratic Party. Bush's poll ratings are extremely low. Voters are frustrated with the progress of the war in Iraq and the Administration's refusal to admit that anything is wrong. The GOP is racked with the Foley teen page scandal. If the Democrats can't make major gains in both the House and the Senate now, the party is truly, truly incompetent.

Of course, there's nothing we can do to help, since we live in the liberal stronghold of the San Francisco Bay Area. Our predictable votes won't be the ones that swing control of Congress to the Dems.

Instead, we can amuse ourselves with the deluge of Propositions and some interesting Board of Supervisor races over who can be the most liberal candidate imaginable.

To make it seem more fun, check out the California Voter Foundation's "Proposition Song". The ballot is way too long, indeed. So buckle your seat belts and hang on, because we're in for a long and bumpy ride.

RANKED CHOICE VOTING:

Voters in San Francisco will select candidates this year using ranked-choice voting, which eliminates the need for a runoff **election**. Any candidate who receives a majority of voters' first-choice selections is declared the winner.

If no candidate receives more than 50 percent of the first-choice selections, the candidate who received the fewest number of first-choice selections is eliminated. Voters who selected the eliminated candidate as their first choice will have their vote transferred to their second choice with the ballots then recounted.

If any remaining candidate receives more than 50 percent of the votes, he or she is declared the winner. If no remaining candidate receives more than 50 percent

To subscribe to the Granick Slate Card,
visit <http://lists.granick.com/listinfo.cgi/slatecard-granick.com>. The Granick Slate Card issues before every California election and is distributed under a Creative Commons license.

of the votes, the process of eliminating candidates and transferring votes to the next ranked candidate is repeated until one candidate has a winning majority.
[Credit: SF Chronicle]

MORE RESOURCES:

SMART VOTER: To find your polling place and ballot, in addition to information about the races.

San Francisco Chronicle Opinion Page

Money in Federal and State races

San Francisco Bay Guardian Endorsements

About me

Here goes....

STATEWIDE RACES FOR OFFICE

Governor: Phil Angelides

Angelides has done a terrible job of informing California voters about who he is and what he stands for. Schwarzenegger, on the other hand, has done a marvelously effective job of putting last year's \$30 million mistake -- three special vanity ballot measures -- behind him. Does anyone remember anything anymore?

There is a school of thought that says that effective campaigns are harbingers of effective administrations. Then there's another school of thought that says that you have to defeat star Republicans like Schwarzenegger before they raise money for other Republicans, like Bush, and effectively lobby voters in important swing states like Ohio before major presidential elections. That's my school of thought. So I'm voting Angelides.

Lieutenant Governor: John Garamendi

The Lieutenant Governor sits around waiting for something bad to happen to the Governor. Garamendi is currently the insurance commissioner and has done a good job in the post, including working on health care issues. He's highlighting his commitment to education and the environment. McClintock is a conservative State Senator. He is making fighting eminent domain, the ability of government to restrict use of private property, one of the hallmarks of his campaign. He's basically a small government social and fiscal conservative.

Apparently, this race is kind of close, so don't let the easiness of the choice or the

aimlessness of the position lull you into failing to check the box.

Secretary of State: Debra Bowen

The Secretary of State operates elections for California. Bowen is running against the incumbent, Bruce McPherson, who was appointed after Democrat Kevin Shelley left the office in disgrace. McPherson has been credited with putting the office back on the right track and normally I'd be inclined to let him stay. But McPherson has embraced electronic voting machines, which are susceptible to error, fraud and digital attack. Almost nothing is scarier than the idea that voting machines might be miscounting votes, with no way to figure out what the real tally is. We need someone in this office who understands that technology is not a panacea for the state's election troubles, but a tool to be securely deployed.

More on evoting in the upcoming election

If you want to geek out on the science and security of electronic voting, [link](#).

Controller: John Chiang

The State Controller audits public spending and tax collection. As a member of the Board of Equalization, John Chiang is focused on tax collection. He also has degrees in both finance and law. Republican Tony Strickland is a former State Assembly member. His priorities including targeting agencies that hand out benefits to illegal immigrants, and repealing the sales tax on gasoline. Not a great idea for improving revenues nor my kind of public policy.

Treasurer: Bill Lockyer

I like Lockyer. Since he's termed out as AG, he's running for Treasure. There is no serious opposition.

Attorney General: Jerry Brown

Brown wants to move from the Oakland mayor's office to the AG's office. Opponent Poochigian is a conservative leaning state senator. He might be fine if the job just entailed prosecuting your run of the mill crimes. But the AG's office sets state policy on a number of consumer rights matters including pollution, reproductive rights and worker safety. Poochigian opposed legalizing medical marijuana, banning high caliber bullets and sending nonviolent drug offenders into treatment before jail. Critics fear he would use this office to undercut those laws. Best case scenario, Poochigian would have to act against his personal beliefs to enforce the law. Brown will be a more vigilant enforcer of the policies Californians have implemented.

Granick Slate Card: November 7, 2006 Election

Insurance Commissioner: Steve Poizner

Sometimes I make a controversial (i.e. Republican) choice and this time it's Poizner. The choice is between Democrat Cruz Bustamante, formerly of Lt. Governor and I-won't-run-against-Gray-Davis-oh-nevermind-yes-I-will fame, and Republican Steve Poizner, a cell phone millionaire. Poizner refuses to accept campaign contributions from the insurance industry. (Of course, he can afford to do so.) Bustamante took \$120K, then returned some of those contributions. The Chronicle claims Bustamante was cozy with the industry during his days in the Assembly. The Bay Guardian says Bustamante's talking about forcing insurers to cut workers' compensation rates when profits are high.

What does Bustamante have to say about all this? He says that high insurance rates are partially because people don't make the right choices, and drive drunk, or fail to watch their health. "I want to become an example to others to lead healthier lives by losing weight myself." His campaign website tracks his efforts to lose weight. That's cute, but after all these years in politics, I think Bustamante should have something greater to point to than his waistline.

NATIONAL RACES

Senator: Dianne Feinstein

Regular readers know that I do not support Feinstein. But this election I do. One of the most important battles in Congress right now is whether the body will insist on checks and balances for the Administration's anti-terrorism efforts, including surveillance of Americans. While Sen Arlen Specter has proposed a law that would make it voluntary for the President to submit his domestic surveillance programs to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC) for review, Senator Feinstein has worked to develop an alternative proposal that affirms that FISC court approval is required for authorizing wiretaps. This is important. We need a powerful person to fight the Republican effort to rubber stamp civil rights violations, and Feinstein can do it. She deserves a show of support, your vote.

Congress, District 6: Lynn Woolsey

She arm wrestled Steven Colbert, lost, and still retained her dignity.

Congress, District 9: Barbara Lee

Lee is a brave woman who opposed the war in Iraq long before doing so was popular.

United States Representative; District 8: Nancy Pelosi

If Democrats retake the House this election, Pelosi could be nominate Speaker. That would be great for California and good for the Party.

Member of the State Assembly; District 13: Mark Leno

Slate Card regulars know that I am a huge fan of Leno. I think he's an effective and principled legislator. He also called a lady he read about in the Chronicle and lobbied her to vote for Anglides. He reads the Chronicle! He cares about individual Democrats. Yay, Leno.

Member of the State Assembly; District 12: No endorsement

Fiona Ma is the Democrat. I don't know much about her. Her reputation is for being rather conservative, and not pro-tenant enough. I believe she is expected to win handily, though.

Barry Hermanson, the Green, is supported by the SFBG: " He was the main sponsor of the city's minimum-wage law and put thousands of dollars of his own money into passing it. Hermanson emphasizes universal health care and renewable energy"

State Board of Equalization; District 1: Betty Yee

This post oversees local assessor's offices and sets tax policy for the state.

JUDICIAL RETENTION

On these races, you can vote to keep or to reject various judges. Usually, I like to vote no on all the judges, just to keep them on their toes and make them think that someone is paying attention. In truth, I believe that a judge should only be removed if he or she fails to follow the law or does something egregious. All of the judges up for confirmation are satisfactory.

COUNTY RACES

Assessor-Recorder; County of San Francisco, Phil Ting

Ting is running unopposed, which is fine because he has been diligent and professional about improving the Office's ability to bring in tax revenues.

Public Defender; County of San Francisco, Jeff Adachi

Running unopposed

BART Board of Directors, District 8: Emily Drennan

Drennan is an alternative transportation activist who wants to push BART to better serve San Francisco, especially by fulfilling its promise to serve Geary Boulevard with an extension. She has served on citizens' advisory groups to regional transportation and air quality agencies.

Her opponent has been on the BART Board for 16 years. Its time for some fresh ideas.

Member, Board of Supervisors; County of San Francisco

Supervisorial District 8: Bevan Dufty

This is my district.

Dufty has been both lauded and criticized for paying attention to every pothole in the Castro. I'm a lauder. The reason we have district elections is to ensure that politicians care about what happens in the neighborhoods that elect them. Dufty does that. Attorney Alix Rosenthal is running on the issues of housing, tenants rights and rising real estate prices. These are important considerations. But Dufty serves our district without being anti-tenant. [The SFBG says he was against requiring real estate agents to disclose to potential buyers when a building has been emptied by Ellis Act evictions, but so was I, because it was just an empty notification with no substantive protection for tenants.] Dufty has earned the right to continue representing us.

Supervisorial District 2: Michela Alioto-Pier

Here are the candidates: Vilma Guinto Peoro -- A 66-year-old former hamburger joint owner. According to SFist: "When asked, [she] was unable to discuss any specifics of Alioto-Pier's legislative record beyond Alioto-Pier's absenteeism. Also, as Ms. Peoro says, 'I was going to run in 2004, but I fell on the stairs and sprained my leg.'"

David Kiddoo, nonprofit housing manager: Kiddoo is a write-in candidate challenging the incumbent as too conservative. The SFBG choice.

Michela Alioto-Pier, incumbent: She generally votes in line with Newsom, preserved St. Bridget's Church from demolition. She gets my vote for having the ability to get her name on the ballot in a timely fashion (unlike Kiddoo) despite having her own leg issues (unlike Peoro).

Granick Slate Card: November 7, 2006 Election

Supervisorial District 4: Doug Chan

The front runner is Doug Chan, supported by Newsom and the Chronicle. Chan has lived in the Sunset for 20 years. He has served on the Police Commission, as a Commissioner on the San Francisco Board of Permit Appeals, the Rent Board, and the Assessment Appeals Board.

Chan's nearest competitor is Jaynry Mak, who served as Supervisor Fiona Ma's chief legislative aide. The Chronicle has reported that Mak may have been involved in laundering money into her campaign through low-wage workers who could not give a politician \$500. This disqualifies her for me.

Also running are Houston Zheng, David Ferguson, Ed Jew, Ron Dudum. Of these, only Dudum appears to have a web page with information about his candidacy. Dudum reports that he is a lifelong Sunset resident who wants neighborhoods where we feel safe, reliable MUNI service, excellent neighborhood schools, affordable homeownership and a city government that spends money wisely.

Supervisorial District 6: Rob Black

This is the race to replace Supervisor Chris Daly, who unfortunately has made himself more of a name for petulant behavior and holding grudges than for legislative effectiveness.

The Chronicle supports Rob Black: "a 37-year-old attorney whose history of working for social justice is matched with a well-grounded sense of the need for visionary urban planning and economic development to sustain jobs, opportunity and quality of life."

Of the rest of the candidates, only Matt Drake and Manuel Jimenez submitted substantive information to the Smart Voter website. Black seems more serious and informed than either.

Supervisorial District 10: Sophie Maxwell

Incumbant Sophie Maxwell has done a vigorous job representing this troubled district. She is in the forefront pushing economic development and public safety. I'm not sure I agree with her solutions, like supporting a Home Depot on Bayshore as a way of bringing jobs into the area, but I appreciate her commitment and diligence in dealing directly with the poverty and safety problems that plague District 10.

STATE PROPOSITIONS

1A Transportation funding: No

Proposition 42, which passed in 2002, says that current taxes on fuel should be spent to improve roads. Because of budgetary issues, we've twice suspended that rule and spent the money on other stuff. This proposition would further limit the conditions under which we could suspend proposition 42.

One of California's biggest problems is that, despite lots of taxes and bonds, the legislature has very little flexibility because most of the money is earmarked for pet projects. 1A further limits the little flexibility we have.

1B Highways and ports: Yes

This measure authorizes the state to sell about \$20 billion of general obligation bonds to fund transportation projects to relieve congestion, improve the movement of goods, improve air quality, and enhance the safety and security of the transportation system. For the Bay Area, the money will help buy new BART cars, a fourth bore for the Caldecott Tunnel, wider highways, carpool lanes and rebuilt interchanges where traffic now stalls, such as Cordelia junction in Solano County. It will cost money, but we need to invest in major infrastructure.

1C Low Income Housing: Yes

We have a serious affordable housing shortage in San Francisco. Our friends have to move away because it's so damn expensive to live here, and soon the only ones left will be the yuppie lawyers like myself and the truly poor. 1C will help. The bulk of this money would go for construction on underused city lots or land near transit lines. This emphasis should reward the Bay Area where land-use policies promote housing near bus and rail lines, but lack the public subsidies to make it happen. There is also money for home-ownership programs, multifamily apartments, farmworker housing and homeless shelters.

1D Public education: Yes

I usually vote against repairing schools, because I believe the problem is that property owners are protected by 1978's Proposition 13 from paying their fair share of taxes. In this case, \$10.4 billion would be spent to repair broken bathrooms and leaky roofs, replacing portable classrooms parked on asphalt with new classrooms, and expanding higher education from community colleges to the two state university systems. Someone less ideological would vote yes.

1E Disaster preparedness: Yes

It calls for \$4.1 billion to upgrade levees, mainly in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta and Central Valley. Katrina.

83 Sex offender monitoring: No

This popular measure would ban any registered sex offender from living within 2000 feet of a park or school. Basically, sex offenders would be unable to live in urban areas, meaning the suburbs would get a disproportionate share. Great! Also, keep in mind that registered sex offenders aren't necessarily rapists or pedophiles. Indecent exposure convictions, for example for urinating or having sex in public, are also registerable offenses. While politicians are afraid to take a stand against this stupid idea, even the Chronicle recommends a "no" vote. This isn't just me being soft on crime.

84 Water and parks: Yes

It's an omnibus measure that covers water quality, parks and environmental projects up and down the state. "Drafted to include something to please nearly every voter" it calls for \$5.4 billion for safe-drinking water, open space on the Peninsula and funds for natural-history museums and aquariums.

85 Teen pregnancy notification: NO!!!

Prop. 85 would amend the California Constitution by requiring physicians or their representatives to notify a parent or legal guardian at least 48 hours before an abortion on a minor is to be performed. While pitched as a pro-parent measure, parental notification is the (allegedly innocuous) point on the anti-choice movement's wedge attack on women's right to terminate a pregnancy. There are great risks to forcing girls who otherwise wouldn't tell their parents that they are pregnant to do so. This measure is driven by Catholic and Protestant churches and anti-abortion activists. Vote no.

86 Tax on cigarettes: Yes

Proposition 86 would raise an estimated \$2.1 billion in one year by taxing cigarettes. The money would be earmarked for health programs. Should the small percentage of our population that smokes be taxed to fund health initiatives for the rest of us? On one hand, cigarette taxes are regressive. Poor people tend to smoke more than rich people and will be harder hit. On the other hand, cigarette taxes encourage people to quit smoking. (Chronicle: "Research suggests that tobacco consumption declines by 4.5 to 6 percent for every 10 percent increase in cigarette taxes".) I'm voting yes.

87 Alternative energy research: YES

Last year, oil companies forked over \$680 million in production fees to the great state of Texas--a drilling tax that exists in nearly every other state of the union, with the notable exception of California. Prop 87 would rectify that quirk of history, levying a tax on Big Oil at a fluctuating rate between 1.5 and 6 percent per each barrel lifted from within our borders. The proceeds would be used to fund a \$4 billion alternative energy research program, which would spark an area of scientific inquiry that for years was neglected by the fat-cat fossil-fuel-addicted energy conglomerates.

Naturally, said oil companies hate this idea and have waged the most expensive initiative battle in state history to defeat it. Their primary argument-- the tax would be passed on to consumers - is hogwash, since oil prices are set globally, and the initiative actually forbids them from simply raising prices locally to pay the new bill. Another argument- that somehow the law would depress real estate prices, sink property taxes and decimate the state education and firefighting budgets, is even more ridiculous.

Leading the charge for the good guys is Hollywood producer Steven Bing, who was heretefore most famous for impregnating Elizabeth Hurley. That feat alone secures our loyalty and admiration. Venture capitalists are also selfishly backing the proposition, because they would surely benefit by the surge in greentech activity. We are prepared to feel bad about that, one day in the hopefully not -too-distant future, as we are filling our gas tanks with grape juice. Vote yes.

88 K-12 education funding: Yes

Proposition 88 would establish a \$50 annual tax on most parcels of land in California to fund improvements in public education. This would be a partial remedy of Proposition 13, the 1978 measure that prevented local government from raising property taxes. This would add \$470 million a year to K–12 school funding.

89 Campaign financing limits: No

If Prop. 89 passes, corporations could spend only \$10,000 to support or oppose any ballot measure. But public interest groups, wealthy individuals and many labor unions still would be allowed to pour unlimited money into an initiative campaign. Yeah. Stick it to the man. But what if the Man is us? The California Teachers Union opposes the Prop, because they think that their organization would be subject to the corporate, not public interest limits. We need comprehensive and true campaign finance reform, not a cynical measure like this. Then again, they do have a cool [rap song](#).

90 Private property protection/Eminent Domain: NO

Often used by government and environmentalists to stop private property owners from destroying communal resources, eminent domain has gotten a bad name recently. Communities have used the doctrine to take the little guy's land and give it to developers or other property owners. ED is out of control, but it serves an important social function when properly deployed. Proposition 90 does not have any balance. Basically, it would help property owners successfully sue the government whenever it restricts the ways owners use their land, including zoning, land use and environmental regulations. This is a dangerous Proposition and everyone should vote No.

CITY PROPOSITIONS

Proposition A: SCHOOL BONDS: No

Proposition A would raise \$450 million for basic improvements to district schools, including Americans with Disabilities Act compliance, seismic upgrades, and fire, health, and safety improvements. In 2001, we learned that school officials misspent \$337 million raised via four previous bond measures. Because the S.F. school district has misspent bond money in the past, a community-based Bond Oversight Committee will monitor the spending. Yeah, right. I'm voting for the state school propositions, but not for this one.

Proposition B: TELECONFERENCE MEETINGS BECAUSE OF PREGNANCY: Yes

This would authorize supervisors and members of city commissions to participate in meetings by teleconference when they're physically unable to attend because of childbirth or pregnancy. I'm not sure why we wouldn't do the same thing for illness.

Proposition C: CITY OFFICIAL SALARIES: Yes

Proposition C would give raises to the mayor, city attorney, public defender, assessor-recorder, treasurer, and sheriff. These salaries were frozen for two years in 1992, with only modest annual adjustments of 1 to 2 percent for the last 14 years. I'm not sure Newsom needs the money, but Sheriff Hennessey deserves a raise.

Proposition D: DISCLOSURE OF PRIVATE INFORMATION: No

The intent of this proposition is to stop the City from disclosing or selling personal information. Like most propositions, it is half-assedly drafted. Media law experts believe it has the potential to conflict with the Sunshine Ordinance and could be interpreted to bar the public disclosure of information that ought to be public. Protecting private information is important, but it has to properly define what is protected.

Proposition E: PARKING TAX: No

This measure would increase the current parking tax of 25 percent to 35 percent. Parking is already pretty damn expensive, and the money will go into the general fund, not be used to improve public transportation, the crappiness of which is why most of us continue to drive.

Proposition F: PAID SICK LEAVE: No

Proposition F requires employers to offer some paid time off when workers or their dependents are sick. Paid sick leave is great, but the biggest losers here would be small businesses. Does the measure do anything to help small businesses, like give a tax break? No. This is a nice idea wrapped in bad policy.

Proposition G: LIMITATIONS ON BIG BOX STORES: No

Dubbed “the Small Business Protection Act,” this measure would interpose so much red tape that Wal-Mart and Target might never be able to move into a neighborhood commercial district. I am opposed to giant corporations moving into the neighborhoods. However, there are some times where these stores can provide a real benefit to the city in terms of attracting customers, jobs and services. We’re not under much threat now. Just look at how long its taken to develop the Bayshore corridor. Let’s leave ourselves the flexibility to decide on a case by case basis.

Proposition H: RELOCATION ASSISTANCE FOR TENANTS: No

This measure would increase the amount of money landlords are required to pay tenants when they’re forced to move out. Right now, tenants receive \$1,000, which is clearly too low to cover the costs of moving, and lower than other cities, like Los Angeles, assure tenants. H would give each eligible tenant two payments totaling \$4,500. The old and the sick would get \$3,000 extra, and each kid would be worth an additional \$3K, too.

To my mind, that’s way too much. The Landlord should cover the cost of the

move, but being kicked out of your apartment shouldn't be a bonanza that results in several months of free rent. I'm for relocation assistance, but against H.

Proposition I: MAYORAL APPEARANCE AT SUPERVISORS' MEETINGS: No

Proposition I requires the mayor to appear once a month at a Board of Supervisors meeting to answer questions, like in the U.K. I have an idea. Why don't we just invite him nicely, Chris Daly?

Proposition J: IMPEACHMENT OF BUSH AND CHENEY: No

Proposition J is a declaration that it's city policy to call for the impeachment of George Bush and Dick Cheney. No one will be surprised that this is what the voters of San Francisco think and I'm against symbolic votes. If we want to impeach these guys, let's do what it takes to put some Democrats who will get it done into office.

Proposition K: HOUSING NEEDS OF SENIORS AND DISABLED ADULTS: No

Proposition K declares that the City should try harder to make life easier for the old and the sick. We all should try harder. So, let's try, rather than let ourselves off the hook with this feel-good proposition.

That's it, citizens. Thirteen pages of Slate Card. Or, you can just take the handy "Clip and Vote" section on the next page with you to the polls.

Liberte, egalite, fraternite:

Jennifer

ClipAndVote ClipAndVote ClipAndVote ClipAndVote ClipAndVote ClipAndVote

STATEWIDE OFFICES

Governor: Phil Angelides
Lieutenant Governor: John Garamendi
Secretary of State: Debra Bowen
Controller: John Chiang
Treasurer: Bill Lockyer
Attorney General: Jerry Brown
Insurance Commissioner: Steve Poizner

US OFFICES

Senator: Dianne Feinstein
Congress, District 6: Lynn Woolsey
Congress, District 9: Barbara Lee
United States Representative; District 8: Nancy Pelosi

STATE GOV OFFICES

Member of the State Assembly; District 13: Mark Leno
Member of the State Assembly; District 12: No endorsement
State Board of Equalization; District 1: Betty Yee

JUDICIAL RETENTION: Ok, but we are watching you!

SF OFFICES

Assessor-Recorder; County of San Francisco, Phil Ting
Public Defender; County of San Francisco, Jeff Adachi
BART Board of Directors, District 8: Emily Drennan
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
District 8: Bevan Dufty
District 2: Michela Alioto-Pier
District 4: Doug Chan
District 6: Rob Black
District 10: Sophie Maxwell

STATE PROPOSITIONS

1A Transportation funding: No
1B Highways and ports: Yes
1C Low Income Housing: Yes
1D Public education: Yes
1E Disaster preparedness: Yes
83 Sex offender monitoring: No
84 Water and parks: Yes
85 Teen pregnancy notification: NO!!!
86 Tax on cigarettes: Yes
87 Alternative energy research: YES
88 K-12 education funding: Yes
89 Campaign financing limits: No
90 Private property protection/Eminent Domain: NO

SAN FRANCISCO PROPS

Proposition A: SCHOOL BONDS: No
Proposition B: TELECONFERENCE MEETINGS BECAUSE OF PREGNANCY:
Yes
Proposition C: CITY OFFICIAL SALARIES: Yes
Proposition D: DISCLOSURE OF PRIVATE INFORMATION: No
Proposition E: PARKING TAX: No
Proposition F: PAID SICK LEAVE: No
Proposition G: LIMITATIONS ON BIG BOX STORES: No
Proposition H: RELOCATION ASSISTANCE FOR TENANTS: No
Proposition I: MAYORAL APPEARANCE AT SUPERVISORS' MEETINGS: No
Proposition J: IMPEACHMENT OF BUSH AND CHENEY: No
Proposition K: HOUSING NEEDS OF SENIORS AND DISABLED ADULTS: No

ClipAndVote ClipAndVote ClipAndVote ClipAndVote ClipAndVote ClipAndVote