

Kinder, Gentler Hardcore

Do adult films require safety gear? One anti-porn crusader thinks so.

By *Jeremy Lybarger*

In *Wet Food 5*, winner of this year's Adult Video News Award for "Best Oral Release," women with the gag reflexes of pythons submit to a circle of "five menacing erections." What makes these hard-ons so fierce is the fact that they're condomless, and that after enough expert manipulation, they deposit "multi-load creamings" onto bare faces.

This is the kind of scene that alarms Michael Weinstein, the president of L.A.-based AIDS Healthcare Foundation. Weinstein is also the controversial Svengali behind an AHF-funded campaign to tighten regulations on California's porn industry.

Weinstein's efforts are gaining traction. Last week, a proposed voter initiative that would make condoms mandatory in California porn gathered

more than 414,000 signatures and qualified for next year's ballot. And last month, after vigorous lobbying by Weinstein and AHF, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration submitted a revised draft of workplace regulations for adult films shot in the state.

Among the proposed new requirements for porn performers: protective eyewear.

"This isn't regulation, this is a complete shutdown of adult production," said Diane Duke, CEO of porn trade group Free Speech Coalition. "Asking adult performers to wear goggles is up there with asking ballerinas to wear boots."

To be fair, goggles aren't mentioned explicitly in OSHA's regulations. But clauses calling for "barrier protection for the

eyes, skin, mouth, and mucous membranes" and prohibiting "ejaculation onto the employee's eyes, non-intact skin, mouth or other mucous membranes" send a clear message: No more facials. That could effectively end California's adult film industry.

"Facials are 90 percent of straight porn," says Chanel Preston, president of the Adult Performer Advocacy Committee. "These regulations make it really difficult, if not impossible, to do our job."

Weinstein and AHF are unsympathetic. They compare the industry's outcry over goggles to "ridiculous and implausible...plots in which the pizza delivery man or

tow truck operator have sex with beautiful women customers."

The regulations, up for an OSHA vote next year, don't stop at eyewear. Mike Stabile of FSC points out that under Weinstein's proposal, "vaginal secretions, pre-ejaculate, and rimming" are also endangered.

And forget about bareback sex. "AHF told us that producers could use fake semen," Stabile says. "Or that we could remove condoms in post-production, which would cost about \$100,000 per film."

Indeed, Weinstein's bill concedes that condoms and other "personal protective equipment," (including goggles, presumably) don't need to be visible in the final film, although there will be a "rebuttable presumption that any adult film without visible condoms" is violating state law.

In another twist, if a film violates the condom mandate, California residents can pursue a civil action against the film's producers. "There's a profit motive to enforce this bill," Stabile says, fearing a predatory cottage industry that scans porn for violations to exploit.

"If this bill and these regulations pass, people will go underground to shoot, which moves the industry backward after we've been trying for years to make it safer and more legitimate," Preston says.



Short-Term Spending

A funny thing happened when the city went to spend Airbnb's back taxes. The \$25 million wasn't there.

In April 2014, hotel alternative Airbnb — then valued at under \$10 billion — announced that it would make like a Hilton and begin paying San Francisco's 14 percent hotel tax. (In reality, the "sharing economy" giant's users pay the tax, which is then collected and sent to the city by Airbnb, but: details.)

That bought Airbnb goodwill with some city elected officials, who were hammering out regulations to allow the company to continue doing business in its home city. But city Treasurer Jose Cisneros maintained that Airbnb still owed tens of millions of dollars in back taxes for the past few years' worth of reservations. That money, about \$25 million, was finally paid in February of this year (a few months before a \$1.5 billion fundraising round pegged Airbnb's value at \$25 billion).

That was good news for the city's bank account and good timing for the Board of Supervisors, which was busy figuring out how to spend the city's \$9 billion-plus municipal budget. But

then a funny thing happened when the Board went looking for that \$25 million: it wasn't there.

Airbnb's back taxes have yet to be "booked" — that is, reflected on the city's ledger as real money that can be spent — by City Controller Ben Rosenfeld.

(Boasts about the back taxes were conspicuously absent from the company's infamous and ill-fated advertising campaign last month, which gloated only about the \$12 million or so the company now pays annually.)

So where's the money? Nobody can say. Inquiries are stymied by city law, which forbid public disclosure of tax records.

This could mean that the city is waiting until lawsuits brought by Expedia and other internet companies are settled. It could also mean that Airbnb is trying to wiggle out of its back tax bill via an appeal of its back taxes — which, unlike current hotel tax payments borne by Airbnb's users, would presumably have come from the company itself.

In San Francisco, if you feel unjustly taxed and want to pay less, you are free to file an appeal and make your case. But first, you have to pay the taxes you don't think you owe.

Airbnb denies any appeal is pending. Reached via email in Paris, where the company is welcoming 6,000 of its

Innocent Until Retweeted

If you're arrested, your face may end up on SFPD's Twitter. Or not.

If you're arrested by the San

Francisco Police Department, your face may end up on Twitter. This year, the SFPD has tweeted 24 booking photos, including those of high-profile suspects such as Kate Steinle's alleged killer Juan Francisco Lopez-Sanchez and Ian Hespelt, the mustachioed bicyclist whose road rage assault went viral.

When local blogger Michael Petrelis asked the SFPD about its social media policy, a department spokesman tweeted (naturally) that booking photos are public record, and those that can be released will be. When pressed by *SF Weekly*, police spokesman Officer Albie Esparza confirmed that there's no "official" social media policy, and that each case's investigating inspector determines which photos go public.

This haphazard approach rankles privacy watchdogs.

"When there aren't clear policies placing limits on what officers can do with our sensitive and personal information — including the posting of booking photos of potentially innocent people to social media — we set officers up to fail, by using their discretion in ways that can violate individuals' privacy and safety," says Tessa D'Arcangelew of the American Civil Liberties Union.

And innocent until proven guilty doesn't apply in the court of public opinion. Mugshots can have long, damaging lifespans online, even if the arrestee was exonerated. *The New York Times* reports that more than 80 websites harvest and archive mugshots. For \$300 to \$400, those same sites will remove a mugshot — a service akin to extortion.

As the 178 retweets of SFPD mugshots this year attests, *Jul* has an eager following online. **JL**

hosts to its annual Open conference, company spokesman Christopher Nulty said that the company's taxes have been paid "in full," and that the company would never seek "any legal claims related to the back taxes we paid."

But until city legislators have the cash in hand and it's being spent on potholes or affordable housing, doubts remain.

"The only thing I know is that Airbnb said it paid its back taxes, but I have no way of confirming that it did," said Supervisor David Campos, a frequent and vocal Airbnb critic. "We trust Airbnb is telling the truth — now we want to verify." **Chris Roberts**