

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Desmond, Jim](#); [MontgomerySteppe, Monica](#); [Anderson, Joel](#); [Lawson-Remer, Terra](#)
Cc: [FGG, Public Comment](#); [San Diego UT Senior Editor](#); [San Diego UT Community Op Ed](#); [Times of San Diego](#); [Robert Johnson Live Data](#)
Subject: [External] AMENDING THE COMPENSATION ORDINANCE (please include with documents for agenda #3)
Date: Thursday, June 19, 2025 8:00:35 AM

Good Morning, Supervisors,

Aren't the unions and yourselves supposed to be about treating people equally?

But here, you and the unions who seem to have totally tossed the equity line, please do not bring it up again, are saddling you with \$390 million dollars of inequitable raises that we get to pay for. Too many people in the same office getting different percentage increases. Why are you telling your people you care about them on a sliding scale. Kind of like us. Please reject these.

Why are the market adjustments all over the board – a few 0%, 1.16%, 1.49%, 2.51, to over 10%. 3% for the Assessment Clerk (maybe make up for the lawsuits he may get for overvaluing properties,) 3.7% for Child Support Attorneys (they will be really busy when the County takes action on the 150 odd Polinsky lawsuits,) 4.08% for Community Health Worker, 9.94% (way over COLA unless you count medical expenses, like being kicked in the head by an angry horse at Artesian Road.) But the king of the raises is the Stock Clerk at 16%.

Protective Services Supervisor gets 13% but a PS Worker only gets 3%. I do not feel as safe now.

The Community Health Promotion Assistant gets 3.19% (compensate for a bad feeling from lying in the ads) while the Community Health Program Specialist gets a paltry 0.12%.

And the park rangers get an 11% raise – be able to afford a quality tent when they are laid off and go homeless.

So people in the same office will end up with different percentage raises. Speak of equity and things that cause stress. This is no way to balance the budget either. I urge you to reject these.

Regards,

Paul Henkin

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Jun 19, 2025 7:49 AM

To: .Supervisor Jim Desmond <jim.desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>, .Supervisor Monica Montgomery-Steppe <Monica.MontgomerySteppe@sdcounty.ca.gov>, .Supervisor Joel Anderson <joel.anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>, .Supervisor Terra LawsonRemer <terra.lawson-remer@sdcounty.ca.gov>

Cc: FGG PublicComment <PublicComment@sdcounty.ca.gov>

Subject: PARTICIPATE IN VIENNA SOCIAL HOUSING FIELD STUDY
(please include with documents for agenda #1)

Hi Supervisors,

Well, it looks like two of you were incited (maybe even invited?) to this housing meeting as a 'renowned leader' where it looks like you will be paying \$15,600 plus airfare, hotel, food, and junket costs (bringing it up to \$40 thou for two people) for a course given by people who have told you that Friday is either September 26 or 27, and there will be a meeting on Friday (or Thursday) to discuss it all.

The Board letter says it is being given by development consultants, which sounds very much like it might be a targeted business course.

Interestingly, the Board letter says “Vienna’s housing model demonstrates successful strategies for integrating low- and moderate-income housing across diverse neighborhoods, reducing housing insecurity, and fostering mixed-income communities,” which is what we’ve done, so I’m not sure what more we can learn from this.

I also am a bit worried when I see “Vienna’s internationally recognized social housing model provides over 60% of its residents with affordable housing options,” since we do not need affordable housing (AKA ghettos) on that scale.

To be honest, I’m all for foreign travel, understanding other cultures, and vacay time, but I think there are better uses for \$40 thou.

Regards,

Paul Henkin