

March 18, 2022

## Haney's Deceptive Barack Obama Endorsement Vote for Campos, Not Haney, for Assembly

by Patrick Monette-Shaw

About the time you read this, San Francisco's Department of Elections will have already put your mail-in ballot for the April 19 Assembly run-off election into U.S. mail, so keep an eye out for it. Be sure to return your ballot promptly so special interests don't steal this election from San Francisco voters!

As expected, David Campos and Matt Haney advanced following the special February 15 primary election and will face off in the April run-off election. As I and political observers predicted, Ms. Selby and Mr. Mahmood were knocked out of contention and didn't advance to the run-off.

### Unqualified Candidates Vanquished

As I [wrote](#) in January's *Westside Observer* on January 10, neither Selby or Mahmood had ever held elected office to a legislative body, and neither had legislative track records under their belts. Most voters consider the lack of previous legislative office and lack of a legislative record as non-starters, disqualifying them from serious consideration due to lack of relevant job experience.

Selby raised \$114,133 for her election through February 24, 2022 and obtained 5,261 votes (5.61%) of the 93,778 ballots cast by East Side voters eligible to vote in Assembly District 17.

By contrast, Mahmood raised \$947,849, 58% of which he had contributed to himself (\$550,000) trying to buy himself an elected seat in government. The \$947,849 Mahmood raised was 46% higher than the \$649,000 voluntary spending cap limit California's FPPC had set for 2021–2022 for primary elections, which Matt Haney and David Campos had agreed to.

Mahmood did snag 20,895 votes (22.3%) of the 93,778 ballots cast by East Side voters eligible to vote in the February 15 primary election. He more than likely received substantial votes from YIMBY members in AD-17, since both California YIMBY and YIMBY Action endorsed Mahmood, given their focus on advocating for market-rate housing, not affordable housing and their misguided belief affordable housing will eventually "trickle down." YIMBY Action has asserted its e-mail list numbers around 10,000 people, many of whom live in AD-17 and were urged to vote for Mahmood.

Notably, the *San Francisco Chronicle* published an article showing the breakouts of which precincts each of the four candidates had won on February 15. The map shows Mahmood snagged votes primarily in precincts in or adjacent to the wealthy Pacific Heights and Dogpatch/Central Waterfront precincts, but few other precincts on the East Side of the City.

Mahmood's hubris involved his apparent belief he could just buy himself an elected legislative seat, rather than having to walk the walk in becoming a politician from the ground up, one election at a time to develop an historical legislative track record to put before voters for consideration of his qualifications to serve.

### Qualified Candidates Advance

It has largely gone unreported that the February 15 primary resulted in a mere difference of less than eight-tenths of one-percent of votes between the two unvanquished candidates, Campos and Haney. Haney finished with 36.44% of the 93,778 ballots cast during the AD-17 primary Special election, and Campos finished with 35.67%.

That's a difference of just 0.77%. Haney garnered 34,174 votes compared to Campos' 33,448 votes — a difference of only 726 votes. With Selby and Mahmood now out of the picture, the April 19 run-off election couldn't be a tighter race.



**David Campos**      **Matt Haney**      **Thea Selby**      **Bilal Mahmood**  
**Two Candidates Didn't Stand a Chance** ... of advancing to the AD-17 State Assembly run-off election in April. Neither Ms. Selby nor Mr. Mahmood had any legislative experience in order to replace Assemblyman David Chiu for the remainder of Chiu's term through the end of 2022. Mahmood was driven by pure hubris.

The *Chronicle* map of precincts noted above shows the of East Side voters, Campos largely prevailed in the Mission District, Excelsior, Bayview-Hunters Point, Glen Park, and Forest Hill neighborhoods, and other precincts, including parts of Matt Haney's own Tenderloin precinct. Haney largely prevailed in other East Side precincts. But of course, there was crossover between voters in the same precincts.

Now it will come down to which candidate is viewed as more credible, and their ability to turn out voters. Unfortunately, Bilal Mahmood wound up endorsing Matt Haney, as did YIMBY action, both putting their thumbs on the scale.

Notably, on Tuesday, March 15 Campos announced Ms. Selby has now endorsed and is supporting him in the April 19 run-off election.

## Campaign Fundraising

Although the voluntary spending cap limit for the February 15 primary was \$649,000 that Haney and Campos had agreed to, California's FPPC increases the voluntary spending cap limit for 2021–2022 for run-off and general elections to \$1,135,000 (\$1.135 million). As of March 11, Haney's fundraising committee had already raised more than the \$1.135 million voluntary spending cap for the April 19 run-off election, but will probably keep raising additional contributions he can roll over to the June 7 primary and November 2022 general elections for a full Assembly term.

Indeed, the *San Francisco Standard* [reported](#) on February 1 prior to the February 15 special election primary that Haney admitted he had already rolled over \$200,000 from his Recipient Committee ID #1441330 he set up for the June 7 primary and November 2022 general election cycle to his Recipient Committee ID #1442544 he set up for the February 15 primary and April 19 run-off elections.

Haney claims he has strong grassroots donor support, and claimed in a [press release](#) that he will not accept corporate PAC (political action committee) donations. But reality seems to have bitten him in his rear end, since both claims appear to be wishful thinking.

**"Haney claims he has strong grassroots donor support, and claimed he wouldn't accept corporate PAC donations. Reality seems to have bitten him in his rear end."**

### Overall Contributions By Dollar Amounts

Campaign contribution data for the AD-17 Assembly election posted on the Secretary of State's web site as of March 11 reveals interesting information about both the Haney and Campos campaigns. Various campaign contribution amount ranges are of interest to voters.

**Table 1: Campaign Contributions, as of March 11, 2022**

Recipient Campaign ID#s:	Matt Haney				David Campos			
	1442544 and 1441330				1441574 and 1440610			
Contribution Amount Range	#	%Mix	Amount	%Mix	#	%Mix	Amount	%Mix
\$4,901 to \$9,700	24	2.4%	\$ 226,500	19.7%	5	0.5%	\$ 39,100	5.7%
\$4,900	107	10.9%	\$ 524,300	45.6%	42	3.8%	\$ 205,800	29.9%
\$1,001 to \$4,899	92	9.4%	\$ 206,449	18.0%	74	6.7%	\$ 171,359	24.9%
\$501 to \$1,000	102	10.4%	\$ 92,689	8.1%	84	7.6%	\$ 82,400	12.0%
\$251 to \$500	176	17.9%	\$ 72,609	6.3%	169	15.4%	\$ 79,869	11.6%
\$1 to \$250	462	47.0%	\$ 72,773	6.3%	722	65.7%	\$ 114,509	16.6%
Returned Donations	19	1.9%	\$ (45,204)	-3.9%	3	0.3%	\$ (5,100)	-0.7%
<b>Total:</b>	<b>982</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>\$ 1,150,116</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1,099</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>\$ 687,938</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Source: Secretary of State's "Quick Search" web site — <https://powersearch.sos.ca.gov/advanced.php>

Despite Haney's claim he has strong grassroots support, Table 1 illustrates several key take-aways:

- First, 65.3% (\$750,800) of the \$1.15 million Haney has raised to date came from the 131 donations of \$4,900 and above, representing just 13.3% of Haney's 982 donors through March 11.

**"Fully 65.3% (\$750,800) of the \$1.15 million Haney raised through March 11 came from 131 donations of \$4,900 and above, representing just 13.3% of Haney's 982 donors."**

By contrast, only 35.6% (\$244,900) of the \$687,938 Campos has raised to date came from the 47 donations of \$4,900 and above, representing just 4.3% of Campos' 1,099 donors through March 11.

- Conversely, just 12.6% (\$145,382) of Haney's \$1.15 million total donations came from the 638 donations of \$500 and below, representing 65% of Haney's 982 donors. Although Haney can claim 65% of his contributors are small-dollar donors, they contributed only 12.6% of his funds raised. That suggests Haney is not running a grassroots campaign.

Again by contrast, 28.3% (\$194,378) of Campos' \$687,938 total donations came from the 891 donations of \$500 and below, representing 81.1% of Campos' 1,099 donors. Campos can rightly assert 81.1% of his contributors are small-dollar donors, contributing almost 30% of his funds raised. That suggests it's actually Campos who is running a grassroots campaign.

- Somewhat shockingly, Table 1 shows that Haney had to refund 19 contributions totalling \$45,204 — 3.9% of Haney's total funds raised. Knowledgeable observers report that *that* many refunds and the dollar amount of the refunds is not typical, but an outlier for any candidate. Of the 19 refunds, three that totaled \$1,300 were to individuals and companies not involved in land-use and building issues that could come before San Francisco's Board of Supervisors. The remaining \$43,905 in refunds to the other 16 donors appear to have been to donors potentially having business before the Board of Supervisors, like real estate developers and property managers, among others.

Even before the February 15 special election primary election, *48Hills.org* reported on January 21, 2022 that "*at least three [real estate] developers who have projects pending or recently approved by the city have donated to Sup. Matt Haney's campaign for state Assembly,*" and that Haney had agreed to return the illegal donations. The three donations totaled \$10,545.

Haney claimed his campaign compliance team didn't catch the illegal donations during their initial donation background acceptance approval process, because "*there is no universal way to search everyone who has or may possibly have in the future a land use matter in front of the city.*" That was ridiculous, in part because by January 10 the Secretary of State's campaign finance reports showed across Haney's two Recipient Committee ID # account, he had received just 138 donations. His campaign compliance team should have been able to spot those three illegal donations.

But the situation was actually much worse. By February 24, campaign finance filing documents revealed Haney's team had issued 17 refunds that totaled \$19,646, which then grew in the two weeks between February 24 to March 11 to 19 refunds totalling the \$45,204. It's unclear why it took nearly two months (since January 21) for Haney's team to get a handle on the illegal donation problem, or whether he'll have to issue additional refunds.

- Most of the time, refunds are typically issued only due to clerical contribution errors. Indeed, of the three refunds Campos issued totalling \$5,100, one was because a donor had hit the wrong button on an *ActBlue* donation screen and had not intended to donate \$4,900 to Campos' campaign.

### **Overall Contributions By Donor Category**

The campaign contribution data posted on the Secretary of State's web site sheds light on the types of donors contributing to each candidate, and illuminates more information of interest to voters.

The FPPC Forms 460's that every campaign is required to file with the Secretary of State has to categorize each donor as being from either "Individuals," "Committees," "Other," "Political Parties," or "Small Contributor Committees." Those categories are inexplicably reported only on the Form 460's, but not reported or included on other mandatory reporting forms. Unfortunately, the Form 460's on the Secretary of State's web site are a hot mess: They're not only difficult to find

---

**“ Just 12.6% (\$145,382) of Haney's total donations came from 638 donations of \$500 and below. That suggests Haney is not running a grassroots campaign.**

**By contrast, 28.3% (\$194,378) of Campos' total donations came from 891 donations of \$500 and below.”**

---



---

**“ Shockingly, Haney had to refund 19 contributions totalling \$45,204 — 3.9% of total funds raised — to donors potentially having business before the Board of Supervisors, like real estate developers and property managers.”**

---

and download, they also have not been “data scrubbed” to eliminate duplicate donations from a single donor on a single date across subsequent Form 460’s submitted. So, the Form 460’s are highly unreliable, extremely time-consuming to analyze without introducing errors, and beyond time constraints of citizen journalists like me.

Instead of relying on the Form 460’s, the donor categories shown in Table 2 were a classification system developed by this author, which were clearly evident by the name of the individual donors in the Secretary of States data.

**Table 2: Donor Category, as of March 11, 2022**

Recipient Campaign ID#s:	Matt Haney				David Campos			
	1442544 and 1441330				1441574 and 1440610			
Donor Category Type	#	% Mix	Amount	% Mix	#	% Mix	Amount	% Mix
Labor Unions	23	2.3%	\$ 115,507	10.0%	—	—	—	—
Union PAC's	58	5.9%	\$ 293,927	25.6%	14	1.3%	\$ 67,200	9.8%
Organizations	8	0.8%	\$ 44,350	3.9%	5	0.5%	\$ 18,200	2.6%
Organization PAC's	18	1.8%	\$ 71,900	6.3%	15	1.4%	\$ 35,291	5.1%
Companies	50	5.1%	\$ 70,946	6.2%	—	—	—	—
Individuals	806	82.1%	\$ 598,690	52.1%	1,062	96.6%	\$ 572,347	83.2%
Returned Donations	19	1.9%	\$ (45,205)	-3.9%	3	0.3%	\$ (5,100)	-0.7%
<b>Total:</b>	<b>982</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>\$ 1,150,116</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1,099</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>\$ 687,938</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Source: Secretary of State's "Quick Search" web site — <https://powersearch.sos.ca.gov/advanced.php>

Table 2 shows the major types of donor categories. Of interest:

- Labor union organizations and labor union political action committees accounted for 81 (8.2%) of Haney’s 982 total donors, who contributed fully \$409,435 (35.6%) of the \$1.15 million Haney had raised through March 11. Clearly, labor unions are spending heavily trying to buy themselves an Assemblyman to do their bidding.

By contrast, labor union organizations and labor union political action committees accounted for just 14 donations (1.3%) of Campos’ 1,099 total donors, who contributed just \$67,200 (9.8%) of the \$687,938 total donations Campos had raised through March 11.

The huge difference between the \$67,200 (9.8%) Campos raised from unions and union PAC’s compared to the staggering \$409,435 (35.6%) Haney raised from unions and union PAC’s speaks volumes.

- Significantly, of the 81 union and union PAC donations totalling \$409,411 to Haney’s campaign, \$311,428 (76.1%) of the \$409,411 was donated by 55 building and construction trade unions and laborer unions (BCTL unions), 68% of the 81 unions and union PAC’s. The \$311,428 donated by the BCTL unions represents fully 27.1% of the total \$1.15 million Haney raised through March 11. The BCTL unions are clearly heavily invested in, and hell-bent on, electing Haney to the Assembly.

By comparison, the 14 labor union PAC’s that donated \$67,200 (9.8%) of Campos’ total campaign donations through March 11 represent nurses and other healthcare workers, teachers and educators, hotel and restaurant hospitality workers, transportation workers (like MUNI employees), and a broad spectrum of professional and technical employees.

- Donations from organizations, organization political action committees (PAC’s), and companies accounted for 76 (7.7%) of Haney’s 982 total donors, who contributed \$187,196 (16.3%) of the \$1.15 million Haney raised through March 11.

By contrast, donations from organizations and organization PAC’s accounted for just 20 (1.8%) of Campos’ 1,099 total donors, who contributed \$53,491 (7.8%) of the \$687,938 total donations Campos raised through March 11.

---

**“ Labor unions and labor union PAC’s contributed fully \$409,435 (35.6%) of funds Haney raised through March 11.**

**By contrast, labor unions and labor union PAC’s contributed \$67,200 (9.8%) of funds Campos raised through March 11.”**

---



---

**“ Of the \$409,411 unions and union PAC donated to Haney’s campaign, building and construction trade unions and laborer unions donated \$311,428, representing fully 27.1% of the total Haney raised through March 11.”**

---

Of note, Haney accepted \$70,946 (5.1%) in donations from companies and corporations, compared to zero such donations to Campos’ because he had pledged to run a corporate-free campaign.

- Although donations from individuals accounted for 806 (82.1%) of Haney’s 982 total donors, they contributed just \$598,690 (52.1%) of the \$1.15 million Haney raised through March 11 (before adjusting downwards for the Returned Donations, all of which were refunds to individuals — other than one \$1,000 contribution to a single company).

Again by contrast, donations from individuals accounted for 1,062 (96.6%) of Campos’ 1,099 total donors, who contributed \$572,347 (83.2%) of the \$687,938 total donations Campos raised through March 11 (before adjusting downwards for the Returned Donations, all of which were refunds to individuals).

This is another clear indicator Mr. Campos has strong grassroots support from individuals in terms of both the percentage of individual donors and the amount his individual donors raised towards his total contributions, illustrating Campos has far greater grassroots support than Haney.

---

**“ Donations from individuals accounted for \$598,690 (52.1%) of total funds Haney raised through March 11.**

**By contrast, donations from individuals accounted for \$572,347 (83.2%) of funds Campos raised through March 11.**

**Campos clearly has far greater grassroots support than Haney.”**

---

### Candidate Endorsements

Endorsements posted on each candidate’s web site as of March 10 illustrate what level of key support they have — beyond campaign donations — and from whom, to help voters assess how to cast their votes. As always, the shifting data is instructive.

**Table 3: Endorsements, as of March 10, 2022**

Type of Endorsement	Matt Haney		David Campos	
	Count	% Mix	Count	% Mix
1 Current SF Supervisors	2	1.9%	6	2.4%
2 Former SF Supervisors	—	—	12	4.9%
3 Former SF Mayors	—	—	2	0.8%
4 State Senators	2	1.9%	5	2.0%
5 State Assembly Members	6	5.7%	8	3.3%
6 Other Elected Officials	4	3.8%	28	11.4%
7 Organizations	15	14.3%	20	8.2%
8 Democratic Political Clubs	6	5.7%	12	4.9%
9 Newspapers	1	1.0%	3	1.2%
10 Building and Construction Labor Unions	15	14.3%	—	—
11 Other Labor Unions	24	22.9%	6	2.4%
12 Individuals and Community Leaders	30	28.6%	143	58.4%
<b>Total:</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Source: Each candidate’s campaign website, downloaded on 3/10/2022.

Table 3 illustrates, in part, the level of endorsements from elected officials, organizations, and individuals and community leaders who ostensibly choose which given candidate better “*plays well with others*” when deciding whom to endorse.

Interestingly:

- Of each candidate’s total endorsements as of March 10, Campos’ 245 endorsements suggest his endorsers believe he “*plays well with others*” 2.3 times *more* than Haney’s 105 endorsers.

---

**“ Campos’ 245 endorsements suggest his endorsers believe he ‘plays well with others’ 2.3 times more than Haney’s 105 endorsers.”**

---

- Including all elected officials, Haney’s endorsements page lists just 14 named elected officials, 4.4 times *fewer* than Campos’ 61 elected official’s endorsements — suggesting elected officials believe Campos “*plays well with others*” much more than Haney.
- Campos received 18 endorsements from current and former City Supervisors, compared to just 2 for Haney. That says a lot about when “*colleagues*” weigh in on who “*plays well with others.*” It’s clear that the majority of Haney’s current and former colleagues on the Board of Supervisors are backing Campos, not Haney.
- Campos received 2 endorsements from former San Francisco Mayors: Art Agnos and Willie L. Brown, Jr. Notably, Willie Brown served for 30 years in the California State Assembly, including 15 years as Speaker of the Assembly. Surely, Brown knows better than anyone which candidate is better suited temperamentally to “*play well with others*” in the Assembly. (**Hint:** Apparently it isn’t Haney.)
- Beyond San Francisco’s elected officials, Campos received 41 endorsements from other state and other elected officials, 3.4 times *more* than Haney’s just 12 such endorsements. That also says a lot about who is considered more likely to “*play well with others*” in Sacramento.
- Campos not only received more on-line endorsements from community organizations, he received twice as many endorsements from Democratic political clubs in San Francisco. Apparently, community organizations and political clubs believe Campos is better suited to “*play well with others.*”
- Campos received three endorsements from San Francisco neighborhood newspapers by March 10 compared to Haney’s single endorsement from a corporate mainstream newspaper — the *San Francisco Examiner*. San Francisco’s progressive *Bay Guardian* newspaper, the *Bay Area Reporter* serving the LGBTQ community, and the *San Francisco Bay View* newspaper serving African American San Franciscans all appear to believe Campos is much more capable of “*playing well with others.*”
- When it comes to endorsements from individuals and prominent community leaders, Campos received 141 such endorsements, 4.8 times *more* than Haney’s 30 endorsements. So, a significant number of individuals and community leaders also appear to believe Campos is better suited to “*play well with others.*”
- The only category of endorsements in which Haney fared better than Campos are the 24 labor unions plus the 15 building and construction trades unions. Those 39 unions — 37.1% of Haney’s 105 endorsements as of March 10 — seem to be candidate-shopping for someone who will “*play well with them*” to do their bidding in the State Assembly, not necessarily someone who will “*play well with others.*”

Of interest, of those 39 labor union endorsements, just 15 (38.5%) are headquartered in San Francisco, although a handful of the remaining 24 unions have affiliated local union branch offices in San Francisco and may have union members who actually live in the City.

As noted in Table 2 above, 55 building and construction trade unions and laborer unions have donated \$311,428 to Haney, fully 27.1% of the total \$1.15 million donated to Haney’s campaign through March 11.

- By contrast, the six labor unions who have endorsed Campos include **AFT Local 2121** that represents City College of San Francisco faculty, the **United Educators of San Francisco** that represents teachers in San Francisco schools, the

---

**“ Campos received 18 endorsements from current and former City Supervisors, compared to just 2 for Haney. That says a lot about when ‘colleagues’ weigh in on who ‘plays well with others.’ ”**

---



---

**“ Campos received 41 endorsements from other state and other elected officials, 3.4 times more than Haney’s just 12 such endorsements. That also says a lot about who is considered more likely to ‘play well with others’ in Sacramento. ”**

---



---

**“ When it comes to endorsements from individuals and prominent community leaders, Campos received 141 such endorsements, 4.8 times more than Haney’s 30 endorsements. A significant number of individuals appear to believe Campos is better suited to ‘play well with others.’ ”**

---

**Transport Workers Union Local 250A** that represents MUNI employees, **UNITE HERE Local 2** that represents hospitality workers in San Francisco’s hotel and restaurants, **NUHW** that represents healthcare workers, and **IFPTE Local 21** (International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers), which is San Francisco’s most influential union after the MEA (Management Executives Association) representing a broad spectrum of professional and technical employees across a wide variety of occupations. Local 21 has contracts with 35 local government agencies throughout the Bay Area.

All six unions choose Campos, in part, because they know he “*plays well with others*” after having worked with him during his eight years serving on San Francisco’s Board of Supervisors.

Between March 1 and March 10, Haney posted just 7 additional endorsements, while Campos posted 50 additional endorsements, to their respective campaign web sites.

## Why Haney Is the Wrong Choice

There are a number of reasons why Haney is the wrong choice to represent those of us who live in AD-17.

First, as the *Westside Observer* reported on January 10, Haney was sworn in to represent San Francisco District 6 on the Board of Supervisors on January 8, 2019. At the point he announced he was running for State Assembly, he had served barely two-and-a-half years as a City Supervisor, raising a question of whether he is using his incomplete first four-year term on the Board of Supervisors as a steppingstone to the State Assembly.

As we reported on January 10, an important reason not to vote for Haney in the Assembly run-off election is that if he is elected to the Assembly, Mayor Breed will appoint a temporary replacement to serve out the remainder of Haney’s first term as D-6 Supervisor, disenfranchising and depriving D-6 voters of their choice and voice in who they want representing them at City Hall.

But there’s much more.

### ***Haney’s Petty Lawsuit Over Campos’s Ballot Designation***

Haney damaged any remaining reservoir of credibility he had from which to draw when he engaged in a petty lawsuit challenging Campos’ official occupation designation on the ballot. It’s clearly the least-important issue voters face in the run-off election, and is of scant interest to voters. Haney spent an unknown amount of money mounting and waging his lawsuit in a misguided hope of winning over a tiny number of voters in what will be a very tight election.

Many view Haney’s lawsuit as part of an orchestrated smear campaign to link Campos to District Attorney Chesa Boudin in a misguided guilt-by-association attempt to encourage voters *not* to vote for Campos.

Although Haney had first filed an administrative complaint with California Secretary of State Shirley Weber over this non-issue, after Weber conducted an investigation, she allowed Campos to list “*civil rights attorney*” as his occupation on the February 15 primary ballot. Unhappy, Haney — knowing there had been a difference of just 726 votes between he and Campos in the February 15 primary election — pressed ahead and filed a formal Superior Court lawsuit against Ms. Weber on February 24, alleging that Campos was “*deliberately attempting to deceive voters.*” Haney’s campaign claimed that there was nowhere else Campos refers to himself as a “*civil rights attorney.*”

---

**“ Haney was sworn in to represent San Francisco District 6 on the Board of Supervisors on January 8, 2019. At the point he announced he was running for State Assembly, he had served barely two-and-a-half years as a City Supervisor, raising a question of whether he is using his incomplete first four-year term on the Board of Supervisors as a steppingstone to the State Assembly. ”**

---



---

**“ Haney damaged his remaining reservoir of credibility from which to draw when he engaged in a petty lawsuit challenging Campos’ official occupation designation on the ballot. It’s clearly the least-important issue voters face. Many view Haney’s lawsuit as part of an orchestrated smear campaign to link Campos to District Attorney Chesa Boudin via misguided guilt-by-association. ”**

---

That's hogwash, or pure horse hockey! Campos had used "*civil rights attorney*" as his occupation as far back as 2008 when he mounted his first campaign to become a City Supervisor. Voters who have followed Campos over the past 14 years have long known that Campos prides himself for his civil rights work as an attorney for several decades.

The *San Francisco Examiner* reported on March 2 that after Haney had complained for months over Campos' choice to list his occupation as a "*civil rights attorney*," a Sacramento Superior Court Judge ruled on March 1 that Campos had to change his occupation on the ballot to "*criminal justice administrator*."

Interestingly, despite Haney winning his Superior Court lawsuit, San Francisco's Department of Elections allowed Campos to use "*civil rights attorney*" as his occupation in the Voter Information Pamphlet for the April 19 run-off special general election that arrived in San Francisco voter's mailboxes on March 17.

Somewhat ironically, Haney himself appears to be deceiving voters in the Voter Information Pamphlet, in which he asserts he secured record investments in housing, public safety, and small business relief (following the COVID pandemic) as Chair of the Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Committee.

That's completely disingenuous: First, Haney became chairperson of the Budget and Finance Committee on January 10, 2021 replacing former-Supervisor Sandra Lee Fewer as Budget chair after she decided not to seek re-election in November 2020. Haney served as chair of the Budget Committee for just over one year, when Board President Shamann Walton announced new Committee Assignments on February 22, 2022 and removed Haney from *both* the Budget and Finance Committee and the separate five-member Budget and Appropriations Committee that typically meets only during hearings leading up to adopting the City's upcoming fiscal year budgets.

---

**“ Ironically, Haney may be deceiving voters in the Voter Information Pamphlet, asserting he secured record investments in housing, public safety, and small business relief as Chair of the Budget and Finance Committee.**

**Haney served as Chair for just over one fiscal year: The July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022 fiscal year budget. Voters may think he's still Chair. He's not. ”**

---

Haney's candidate statement in the April 19 Voter Guide is deceptive, in part, because it may lead voters to think he's still Chairperson of the Budget Committee. He's not, and no longer serves in any capacity on either Budget committee.

Observers had wondered whether Haney stepped down from the two budget committees in order to free up his time to campaign for assembly elections that will continue into June and then November.

And second, Haney's claim he secured "*record budget investments*" in the three policy areas clearly deceives voters.

During his one-year stint as Budget Chair, Haney presided over development of a single fiscal year City budget — the July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022 fiscal year budget. Absent detailed fact-checking, knowledgeable observers don't recall "*record budget investment*" increases in any of these three policy areas (housing, public safety, and small business relief) in the FY 2021–2022 budget adopted.

Haney's claim of "*record investments*" is more like election sloganeering or sheer puffery, rather than actual fact. While stretching the truth may not be a real crime (unless perhaps you're named Donald Trump), it's definitely a deceptive claim to put before voters.

Haney really can't claim he single-handedly secured those investments, since it takes at least eight supervisors to pass budget allocations and to prevent a mayoral veto. At best, it's hyperbole or sheer bluster for any single Supervisor to assert he "*secured*" these *record investments* all on his own.

Asked about Haney's fantastical claim, a long-time and reputable City Hall insider, speaking on condition of anonymity, noted my impressions are correct and indicated "*Haney is full of sh\*#*" (pardon my source's use of the vernacular). Haney seems to be blissfully unaware of just how low his City Hall colleagues regard him.

---

**“ Asked about whether Haney's claim of 'record investments' may deceive voters, a long-time and reputable City Hall insider, speaking on condition of anonymity, noted my impressions are correct and indicated 'Haney is full of sh\*#' (pardon the vernacular). ”**

---

You can't miss the irony that Haney claimed Campos was potentially attempting to deceive voters with a choice of occupation to be listed on the ballot, yet Haney is brazen enough to deceive those same voters in the Voter Pamphlet about "record investments."

### **Haney's Allegation Campos Doesn't "Play Well With Others"**

In addition to the discussion above disproving a false [allegation](#) in the *San Francisco Chronicle* on February 20 attributed to Haney that Campos is "not being a good team player" (implying Campos doesn't "play well with others"), voters should not forget that Campos served on the San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee (DCCC) for five years between 2016 and 2021 and was elected and served as DCCC Chair between 2017 and 2021. Campos is currently one of two Vice Chairs of the California Democratic Party.

Campos clearly would not have been elected as chair of San Francisco's DCCC or vice chair of California's Democratic Party if he isn't a good team player who knows how to "play well with others." And he wouldn't have his legislative track record developed over his eight years on San Francisco's Board of Supervisors unless he was a good team player.

### **Haney's P.R. Disaster Bashing Campos**

Haney appears to be afraid of his own shadow in bashing Campos in the media. Haney — and independent expenditure committees supporting Haney — have falsely alleged Campos had been responsible for the "Monster in the Mission" battle in 2015 over a proposal by a private developer, Maximus, to build 330 units of housing at 16th and Mission in San Francisco's Mission District, many of which were proposed to be market-rate housing, not affordable housing.

That was completely false, because the "Monster in the Mission" opponents were community activists, not Campos or the Board of Supervisors being the instigating opponents.

YIMBY members and building and construction trades unions attacked the community activists — who only were Campos' District constituents coincidentally — as being "anti-housing," which was ridiculous because the community members were simply "anti-displacement." The Mission District has lost 8,000 Latino residents over the past decade; the Mission had been 52% Latino a decade ago but is now down to 40%.

It's patently unfair — and factually incorrect — to label either those community activists, or Campos, who opposed massive displacement as being "anti-housing." Campos' only involvement was introducing legislation at the Board of Supervisors to create a temporary moratorium on building more market-rate housing for a short 45-day period, which legislation was never approved by the Board of Supervisors that even then-Supervisor London Breed had supported and had voted for.

*48Hills.org* has provided great [reporting](#) about this false allegation against Campos, noting that the 16th and Mission site is now on pace to be fully 100% affordable housing, which hopefully will prevent additional displacement from the Mission.

### **March 30 Update: More of Haney's Hypocrisy Exposed**

On March 30, *48Hills.org* [reported](#) an update about Haney's hypocrisy about the "Monster In the Mission" housing fight.

While Haney has been busy rolling out last-minute attack ads against Campos over a project which sought to impose a 45-day moratorium only on "luxury housing" in the Mission, Haney supported Prop I in 2015 and 2016 for the same moratorium.

Basically, Haney and his allies are now shamefully attacking Campos for something Haney also supported at the time, along with Breed.

---

**" Haney falsely alleged Campos had been responsible for the 'Monster in the Mission' battle in 2015 over a proposal by a private developer, Maximus, to build 330 housing units in the Mission District. That was completely false. 'Monster in the Mission' opponents were community activists, not Campos or the Board of Supervisors. "**

---



---

**" YIMBY members and the building and construction trades unions attacked the community activists as 'anti-housing.' That was also false. The community members were 'anti-displacement,' not 'anti-housing'.**

**Haney and YIMBY had to know this. The Mission site is now on pace to be 100% affordable housing, which hopefully will prevent additional displacement. "**

---



---

**" Haney and his allies are now shamefully attacking Campos at the last minute before the April 19, 2022 run-off election for something Haney also supported at the time, along with Breed, in 2015 and 2016. "**

---

### **Haney Is Deceiving Voters on His Housing Record**

As the *Westside Observer* reported in January, Haney has repeatedly claimed he brought 5,000 new housing units to District 6, but has never stratified how many of those units were affordable housing vs. market-rate housing.

He's playing a terrible game of semantics, because he continues to claim that achievement both on his campaign web site, in the Voter Information Pamphlet that arrived in U.S. Mail on March 17, and in a campaign mailer that arrived in voters mailboxes on March 18.

It's the height of hypocrisy that Haney wrongly claimed Campos was deceiving voters by Campos' choice of occupation to be listed on the ballot, when it's obvious Haney is deliberately deceiving voters via his claims about his record creating massive amounts of housing.

*48Hills.org* [published](#) a great rejoinder that should — but probably won't — stop Haney from continuing to make this deceptive claim to voters: Matt Haney hasn't built any housing. He hasn't created any housing. The Board of Supervisors don't build housing. Private developers build housing. Per *48Hills*:

*“The only role Haney — or any supervisor — has in building housing is voting on appeals of Planning Commission decisions (and working with neighbors and community groups to cut deals to get private development projects approved), changing zoning laws, or organizing for and approving money for affordable housing projects.”*

### **Haney's “Grassroots Donations” Deceit**

Speaking of Haney deceiving voters, let's not forget his campaign web site's wild claim that he is receiving significant grassroots campaign donations and is running a grassroots campaign. It's not clear how Haney and his campaign team define “grassroots.”

As discussed involving Table 1 above, 65.3% of total donation amounts to Haney by March 11 were from donations of \$4,900 and above, and a paltry 12.6% of his total donation amounts involved \$500 or less. Neither are reflective of broad grassroots support.

Table 2 above illustrates that fully 35.6% of total donation amounts to Haney were from labor unions and labor union PAC's. That's not grassroots support either. Just 52.1% of Haney's total donation amounts came from individuals, compared to 83.2% of donations from individuals to Campos.

And finally, when it comes to endorsements on Haney's web site, he received just 30 endorsements from individuals by March 10, compared to 143 individuals who endorsed Campos. That's not grassroots endorsement support.

All of which leads observers to conclude Haney is also deceiving voters about his level of grassroots support. Haney may not understand that simply claiming something doesn't make it true.

### **Haney's Supporters Advocate for Legislative Carve-Outs**

Various of Haney's supporters have advocated for legislative and policy carve outs, although not directly with Haney. Still, it should be of concern to voters.

---

**“ Haney repeatedly claimed he brought 5,000 new housing units to District 6, but has never stratified how many of those units were affordable housing vs. market-rate housing.**

**He is deliberately deceiving voters via his claims about his record creating massive amounts of housing.”**

---



---

**“ As shown, 65.3% of total donations to Haney by March 11 were donations of \$4,900 and above, and a paltry 12.6% of his total donations involved \$500 or less.**

**Neither are reflective of broad grassroots support. To claim otherwise appears to be more voter deception.”**

---

### **Safai's Proposed Charter Amendment Carve-Out**

On January 24, 2022 Supervisor Ahsha Safai (who has endorsed Haney) introduced a Charter Amendment via an [Ordinance](#) sponsored only by him — but ostensibly on behalf of Mayor Breed — to place a ballot measure on the June 7, 2022 ballot at the Board of Supervisors Rules Committee purportedly to streamline review of permits for affordable housing. As *48Hills.org* has reported, we really don't need more “streamlining” legislation, since that's not the main impediment to getting housing projects approved and actually built.

First, Safai's Charter Amendment contained one provision to increase the definition of “affordable” housing units for households having incomes of up to 140% of Area median income (AMI); that would drastically expand the definition of “affordable” to include allowing a family of four to earn up to \$186,500. How many San Francisco households earn \$186,500 annually?

Second, Safai's Charter Amendment contained another provision to enshrine prevailing wages protections for housing construction workers in the City Charter, a provision that was roundly rejected by members of the Board of Supervisors Rules Committee and members of the public who testified against Safai's Charter change proposal.

It was painfully clear Safai was doing the bidding of the building and construction and laborers' unions in attempting to add a carve out to include prevailing wage standards in our City Charter, which would have become nearly impossible to remove from the Charter in the future without having to go back to voters to get the provision removed.

Thankfully, Safai's Charter change measure was tabled and didn't advance out of the Rules Committee. It won't appear on San Francisco's June 7 municipal ballot, although Safai may try another way to get it placed on a future ballot.

### **Building and Construction Unions Pressured for Prevailing Wages Carve-Out**

Back in 2019, building and construction trade unions — that are now spending heavily to back Haney — succeeded in pressuring MOHCD into a carve out regarding prevailing wage protections for their dues-paying union members.

A facsimile of a June 6, 2019 [letter](#) from the San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) to Larry Mazzola, Jr., president of the San Francisco Building & Construction Trades Council (BCTC), shows MOHCD's then Executive Director, Kate Hartley, sought to allay concerns raised by Mazzola, who is also the Secretary-Treasurer of the Plumbers and Pipefitters Union Local 38 in San Francisco. [Note: The “facsimile” letter was produced by this author by comparing Hartley's draft letter to her final version, both acquired under public records requests.]

Mazzola had phoned Hartley about his concerns supporting the \$600 million *Affordable Housing Bond* on San Francisco's November 2019 ballot. Mazzola had sought reassurance that MOHCD would support and facilitate union labor to the greatest extent possible on the affordable housing projects. In Hartley's first draft of a written reply to Mazzola on May 31, 2019 she noted that on the \$310 million *2015 Affordable Housing Bond* MOHCD had documented BCTC union participation rates of between 99.25% to 100% on the *2015 Bond* projects. She assured Mazzola that the planned projects for “covered categories” of projects for the *2019 Bond* would also include at least 90% BCTC union participation rates.

Mazzola apparently didn't like Hartley's first draft, and demanded and obtained changes.

---

**“Supervisor Ahsha Safai introduced a Charter Amendment to place a ballot measure on the June 7, 2022 ballot. First, it contained one provision to increase the definition of ‘affordable’ to 140% of AMI, which would drastically expand the definition of ‘affordable’.”**

---



---

**“Second, Safai's Charter Amendment contained another provision to enshrine prevailing wages protections for housing construction workers in the City Charter. Safai's Charter change measure was tabled and didn't advance out of the Rules Committee. It won't be on the June 7 municipal ballot.”**

---



---

**“In 2019, building and construction trade unions — now spending heavily to back Haney — succeeded in pressuring MOHCD into a carve out regarding prevailing wage protections for their dues-paying union members.”**

---

First, Hartley agreed to strike out and remove a reference that some of the *2019 Bond* projects might involve (factory built) “*modular construction*” assembled off site without using BTC union labor. That may prevent MOHCD from future consideration of using modular construction for any housing projects, whether for the homeless or low-income households. It was a huge win for Mazzola, but a huge loss for the rest of us.

As a matter of practice, construction trade unions oppose modular construction precisely because it may not involve paying prevailing wages to their union members. Second, although Hartley had assured Mazzola that “*existing public housing sites which receive bond funding [would be] be subject to prevailing wage requirements*,” Mazzola apparently wanted stronger prevailing wage language, so Hartley added an additional paragraph assuring him that the prevailing wage and apprenticeship requirements referenced for Covered Work projects would be included in the loan agreements MOHCD executes with affordable housing project developers/owners. Mazzola not only prevailed against MOHCD on the prevailing wage issue, the modular housing language also vanished.

### **Mazzola’s Hatred of Modular Construction**

Mazzola and the construction trades unions deeply fear modular housing. Back in March 2021, the *San Francisco Chronicle* published an [article](#) about efforts in San Francisco to use modular construction of housing units for homeless people. The article reported on a project to build affordable housing for the homeless at 833 Bryant Street across from the former Hall of Justice, which was vigorously opposed by Mazzola and his union.

The *Chronicle* reported the modular housing project is being built in a factory in Vallejo that contracts with the Carpenters Union of Northern California, faster and cheaper than typical affordable housing projects in San Francisco. Instead of projects taking six years or longer to construct at an average of \$700,000 per unit, the 833 Bryant project will take just three years and average \$383,000 per unit. That shaves off three years to bring affordable housing projects to market in the lease-up stage, and costs 82.8% less per unit. Who can oppose shaving three years off of desperately-needed housing production?

Imagine how many fewer people wouldn’t be homeless in San Francisco (or statewide throughout California) if we had more modular housing projects for the homeless. For that matter, how many more San Franciscans could afford to purchase homes, or rent apartments, were there more modular affordable housing projects for everybody else who isn’t actually homeless?

No wonder Mayor London Breed may be open to more modular projects, as was Bilal Mahmood in his efforts to win election to Assembly District 19. The *Chronicle* reported that even Haney was open to the idea of more modular housing projects. As far as that goes, YIMBY California and San Francisco’s YIMBY Action should be advocating for more modular housing projects, too, after having endorsed and supported Mahmood during the February 15 primary.

As president of the San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council, Larry Mazzola opposes everything about modular housing, like a *money changer in the temple* extorting money from San Francisco voters.

Mazzola and his allies want to make sure money they’ve donated to Haney to buy themselves an Assemblyman in Sacramento will prevent modular housing from being utilized to help solve

---

**“ Ms. Hartley agreed to strike out and remove a reference that some of the 2019 Bond projects might involve (factory built) ‘modular construction’ assembled off site without using union labor.**

**Hartley added an additional paragraph assuring Mazzola that prevailing wage and apprenticeship requirements would be included in loan agreements MOHCD executes with affordable housing project developers/owners.”**

---



---

**“ Mazzola and the construction trades unions deeply fear modular housing.**

**Instead of projects taking six years or longer to construct at an average of \$700,000 per unit, the 833 Bryant modular project will take just three years and average \$383,000 per unit. That shaves off three years to bring affordable housing projects to market and costs 82.8% less per unit.”**

---



---

**“ Mazzola and his allies want to make sure money they’ve donated to Haney to buy themselves an Assemblyman in Sacramento will prevent modular housing from being utilized.”**

---

California's housing shortage crisis. Haney will soon fold on modular housing, if he knows what's good for his political career and his campaign donations.

## The Choice Is Clear

As a knowledgeable, prominent, and astute African American friend of mine notes: *"Haney was doing great for a while, especially on Treasure Island, but when he decided to try to jump to the State legislature, he made a hard right turn."* She meant Haney did a hard right turn from being a progressive to being a moderate, willing to bow to the building and construction trades and laborer unions.

If Haney wins on April 19, we'll have another compliant legislator in Sacramento all too eager to restrict local land use decisions and affordable housing projects in San Francisco.

If you want to send another legislator who is *"full of sh\*#"* (using the words of my anonymous City Hall source) to Sacramento, by all means — vote for Haney.

Otherwise, if you want a more qualified Assemblyman with a long list of accomplishments and strong grassroots support, cast your vote for Campos as soon as you receive your vote-by-mail ballot!

## March 28 Postscript: "Speaking in Forked Tongue"

The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines talking with a *"forked tongue"* as: *"Speaking in a dishonest way that is meant to deceive people."* I'm struck by how that may apply to Matt Haney.

Haney's lawsuit forcing Campos to change his occupation listed on the ballot wrongly asserted Campos was potentially deceiving voters by saying he was a *"Civil Rights Attorney."* But a recent *"Haney Housing Plan"* flier received in U.S. Mail from his official campaign in the past week didn't once mention Haney's occupation listed on the ballot is *"[City] Supervisor."* Instead, the flier notes that Haney is a *"tenants' rights attorney."* While that may be commendable service, Haney's *pro bono* work helping an unknown number of renters with their tenant rights is not his current principal occupation, so is somewhat deceptive. Haney's law degree from Stanford Law School in 2010 was in education law, not tenant's rights law.

Unexplained is why Haney found Campos' designation in January 2022 as a *"Civil Rights Attorney"* to be deceptive, but his own designation as a *"tenants' rights attorney"* three months later is somehow OK. Perhaps, if you're speaking with a forked tongue.

Then there's a small problem with Board of Supervisor Committee hearings. When Board President Shamann Walton announced new Board Committee assignments in March 2022 and removed Haney from the two different Budget Committees effective March 10 but implemented in February, Walton kept Haney as a member of the Public Safety and Neighborhood Services (PSNS) Committee.

Haney was absent from the PSNS Committee meeting on March 24 during a key committee meeting about two critical public health issues, one including two public conservatorship items facing people with mental health issues and are homeless, and a separate issue about the lack of sub-acute skilled nursing facilities in San Francisco resulting in out-of-county patient discharges and legislation to require reporting the out-of-county patient discharge data.

Where was Haney? Why did he skip this key hearing?

The next day, news surfaced that Campos is polling six percentage points ahead of Haney for the April 19 run-off election. Despite that potential lead, **make sure you return your vote for Campos before April 19!**

---

**" An astute African American friend notes: 'Haney was doing great for a while ... but when he decided to try to jump to the State legislature, he made a hard right turn'."**

---



---

**" Vote for Campos as soon as you receive your vote-by-mail ballot! "**

---



---

**" Haney found Campos' designation in January 2022 as a 'Civil Rights Attorney' to be deceptive, but Haney's designation as a 'tenants' rights attorney' three months later is somehow OK? "**

---



---

**" Haney was absent from the March 24 Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee meeting involving two key agenda items. Where was Haney? Why did he skip attending this key hearing? "**

---

## **Haney Deceptively Riding Obama's Coattails**

All along, Haney's campaign web site has been potentially deceiving voters about an endorsement he received from former president Barack Obama, which wasn't for election to the State Assembly. It has been a sleight-of-hand claim all along.

On Monday, March 28 an independent expenditure committee — the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) Local 3299 PAC — shamelessly began broadcasting a potentially deceptive ad on ABC TV Channel 7, repeating the same claim Haney was endorsed by former president Obama.

Both Haney's web site and AFSCME Local 3299's TV ads are potentially deliberately deceiving voters, for two reasons.

First, Haney's web site completely eliminates mentioning that Obama had endorsed Haney way back in 2016 — for re-election to San Francisco's school board, citing Haney's leadership on issues facing school systems as an education lawyer.

Second, Haney's web site [creatively edited](#) Obama's verbatim endorsement by removing Obama's explicit language he was endorsing Haney for the *school board* to fight for students, families, and educators to support Haney's re-election. Haney replaced key phrases of Obama's endorsement using ellipses, which altered the context and scope of Barack's endorsement.

*“Matt is an extraordinary leader, ~~working towards a 21st century school system where all of our children can fulfill their potential,~~” Obama said in a statement. “~~Matt listens to and fights for students, educators, and families.~~ ... I believe Matt represents the passion, commitment and vision that we need in our elected leaders.”*

— President Barack H. Obama, *November 5, 2016*

The strike outs shown in red illustrate Haney's sheer chutzpah in audaciously eliding (omitting) the actual language Obama had used in his 2016 endorsement that was reported at the time in the [San Francisco Examiner](#). It is clear Obama's 2016 testimonial was to endorse Haney for election to the school board, not to the Assembly. Haney is conflating and confounding *leadership in education* with *leadership in legislating*, mixing up two distinct skills and abilities.

You have to wonder whether Haney obtained permission from Obama six years after-the-fact to creatively and purposefully edit Obama's actual endorsement language to coast on Obama's coattails. You also have to wonder whether Obama knows Haney is potentially twisting the intent of Obama's endorsement.

Haney is essentially recycling Obama's six-year old endorsement to imply Obama is endorsing Haney for 2022 election to California's state assembly. Obama has done no such thing.

Independent expenditure committee campaign disclosure reports downloaded from the Secretary of State's web site on March 29 revealed AFSCME Local 3299 plans expenditures of \$531,296 made through March 2 for the purpose of its television ads. It's not yet known if AFSCME will spend even more on TV ads through the April 19 run-off election.

Although AFSCME's TV ad does mention Obama's endorsement was made in 2016 and claims it's now our turn to support Haney, the ad doesn't mention at all Obama's endorsement was for Haney's election to the school board, so it may deceive voters, whether inadvertently or intentionally. Haney must surely be aware AFSCME's ad may be deceiving voters, however unintentionally.

Given news about the scope of Haney's misinformation and deceit (including about Obama), voting for Haney is a mistake.

**[Full Disclosure:** I have donated to Mr. Campos' election campaign for State Assembly.]

*Monette-Shaw is a columnist for San Francisco's Westside Observer newspaper, and a member of the California First Amendment Coalition (FAC) and the ACLU. He operates [stopLHHdownsize.com](#). Contact him at [monette-shaw@westsideobserver.com](mailto:monette-shaw@westsideobserver.com).*

---

**“ An independent expenditure committee shamelessly began airing TV ads on March 28 asserting Haney was endorsed by former president Barack Obama. It's potentially deceptive for several reasons.”**

---



---

**“ Second, Haney or his campaign team creatively edited Obama's verbatim endorsement by removing Obama's explicit language that he was endorsing Haney for the school board. It's potentially a deliberate attempt to deceive voters into thinking Obama has endorsed Haney to advance to the State Assembly. Obama has not!”**

---