
ATTACHMENT

#4

For Item

#17

Tuesday,
February 8, 2022

PUBLIC COMMUNICATION RECEIVED BY THE
CLERK OF THE BOARD

DISTRIBUTED 02/08/2022

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:45 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: FW: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

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

From: Keith McKenzie <kfkmca@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 8:43 PM
To: Vargas, Nora <Nora.Vargas@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS) <Nathan.Fletcher@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Cc: Eldridge, Lonnie <Lonnie.Eldridge@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Robbins-Meyer, Helen <Helen.Robbins-Meyer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Potter, Andrew <Andrew.Potter@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Medved, Marko <Marko.Medved@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Subject: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

Dear Chairman Fletcher and members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am a pilot and I'm writing to urge you to NOT adopt the proposed Working Families Ordinance - however, if you do, PLEASE EXEMPT all County Airports to ensure continued air safety and FAA grant funding. I depend on these businesses and to have them leave would be a terrible impact to the airport, the community, the employees, and the flying public.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

I am urging you to amend the ordinance that when the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

I thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Keith McKenzie

Sent from a mobile device - please excuse typos and/or brevity.

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:45 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: FW: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

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

From: Lori Heiliger <heiliger2@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 8:54 PM
To: Vargas, Nora <Nora.Vargas@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS) <Nathan.Fletcher@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Cc: Eldridge, Lonnie <Lonnie.Eldridge@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Robbins-Meyer, Helen <Helen.Robbins-Meyer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Potter, Andrew <Andrew.Potter@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Medved, Marko <Marko.Medved@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Subject: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

Dear Chairman Fletcher and members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to NOT adopt the proposed Working Families Ordinance - however, if you do, PLEASE EXEMPT all County Airports to ensure continued air safety and FAA grant funding.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

I am urging you to amend the ordinance that when the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

I thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Lori Heiliger

Sent from my iPhone

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:45 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: FW: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

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

From: Gary H Gobel <garyhgobel@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 9:32 PM
To: Vargas, Nora <Nora.Vargas@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS) <Nathan.Fletcher@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Cc: Eldridge, Lonnie <Lonnie.Eldridge@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Robbins-Meyer, Helen <Helen.Robbins-Meyer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Potter, Andrew <Andrew.Potter@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Medved, Marko <Marko.Medved@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Subject: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

Dear Chairman Fletcher and members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to NOT adopt the proposed Working Families Ordinance - however, if you do, PLEASE EXEMPT all County Airports to ensure continued air safety and FAA grant funding.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

I am urging you to amend the ordinance that when the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

I thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,
Gary H. Gobel

Gary Gobel
Sent from my iPhone

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:46 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: FW: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

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

From: OIF <oifcarroll@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 10:04 PM
To: Vargas, Nora <Nora.Vargas@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS) <Nathan.Fletcher@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Cc: Eldridge, Lonnie <Lonnie.Eldridge@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Robbins-Meyer, Helen <Helen.Robbins-Meyer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Potter, Andrew <Andrew.Potter@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Medved, Marko <Marko.Medved@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Subject: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

Dear Chairman Fletcher and members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to NOT adopt the proposed Working Families Ordinance - however, if you do, PLEASE EXEMPT all County Airports to ensure continued air safety and FAA grant funding.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

I am urging you to amend the ordinance that when the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

I thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Michael K. Carroll

Sent from my iPhone

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 5:11 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: FW: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: iiiajd <iiiajd@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 5:11 PM
To: Vargas, Nora <Nora.Vargas@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS) <Nathan.Fletcher@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Cc: Eldridge, Lonnie <Lonnie.Eldridge@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Robbins-Meyer, Helen <Helen.Robbins-Meyer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Potter, Andrew <Andrew.Potter@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Medved, Marko <Marko.Medved@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Subject: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

Dear Chairman Fletcher and members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to NOT adopt the proposed Working Families Ordinance - however, if you do, PLEASE EXEMPT all County Airports to ensure continued air safety and FAA grant funding.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

I am urging you to amend the ordinance that when the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

I thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey D. Warren
Major, U.S. Marine Corps, (Ret.)
Chief Ground Instructor,
Golden State Aviation
1640 N. Johnson Ave.,
El Cajon, CA 92020
Office: (619) 449-0611
email: iiiajd@hotmail.com

Sent from my T-Mobile 5G Device

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Candise Tu <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 5:35 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - reject the ordinance or exempt airport land

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Please vote for option 2C to REJECT the proposed drafts of the Working Families Ordinance.

If you do choose to approve an ordinance, please include the airport exemption language proposed by the Gillespie Pilots Association.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

Should you choose to go forward with a version of this ordinance, I ask that you include an amendment so that if the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

The impact of this ordinance would be catastrophic on my business. I run a small business that is female Asian American owned. Two thirds of my staff is female and we have 4 Veterans on staff as flight instructors. We are one of the few flight schools remaining in San Diego County that can still serve veterans wishing to use their VA education benefits. Over half of our staff is Asian or Hispanic. This would destroy our business.

Thank you for considering my perspective.

Candise Tu
ctu@civichelicopters.com

2206 Palomar Airport Road
Carlsbad, California 92011

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Ziki Churchill <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 5:39 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - reject the ordinance or exempt airport land

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

DO NOT MAKE ME LOSE MY JOB. I DO NOT NEED A \$50 PER HOUR JOB I NEVER WILL BE ABLE TO SEE BECAUSE MY BELOVED HANGER FULL OF HELICOPTERS WILL BE SHUT DOWN FOR GOOD.

I'm a immigrant from a third world country. I never thought this would happen here.

Please vote for option 2C to REJECT the proposed drafts of the Working Families Ordinance.

If you do choose to approve an ordinance, please include the airport exemption language proposed by the Gillespie Pilots Association.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

Should you choose to go forward with a version of this ordinance, I ask that you include an amendment so that if the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

Thank you for considering my perspective.

Ziki Churchill
2wingsr4fairies@gmail.com
1190 Tuscany Court
Encinitas, California 92024

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Tamera Faumuina <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 5:45 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - reject the ordinance or exempt airport land

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Please vote for option 2C to REJECT the proposed drafts of the Working Families Ordinance.

If you do choose to approve an ordinance, please include the airport exemption language proposed by the Gillespie Pilots Association.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

Should you choose to go forward with a version of this ordinance, I ask that you include an amendment so that if the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

Thank you for considering my perspective.

Tamera Faumuina
tami@civichelicopters.com
2635 Cannon Rd #342
Carlsbad , California 92010

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Julian Morales <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 5:50 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - reject the ordinance or exempt airport land

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Please vote for option 2C to REJECT the proposed drafts of the Working Families Ordinance.

If you do choose to approve an ordinance, please include the airport exemption language proposed by the Gillespie Pilots Association.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

Should you choose to go forward with a version of this ordinance, I ask that you include an amendment so that if the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

Thank you for considering my perspective.

Julian Morales
juliancito96@gmail.com
390 Pala Vista Dr. Apt.6
Vista, California 92083

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Wenhan Fan <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 5:57 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - reject the ordinance or exempt airport land

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Dear Supervisors,

I am a flight training student at Palomar Airport, and I hope to one day immigrate to the US. I hope to work as a pilot one day, but I am told that if this law goes into effect, the school I am at will probably close, and will definitely not be able to take foreign students anymore.

Please vote for option 2C to REJECT the proposed drafts of the Working Families Ordinance.

If you do choose to approve an ordinance, please include the airport exemption language proposed by the Gillespie Pilots Association.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

Should you choose to go forward with a version of this ordinance, I ask that you include an amendment so that if the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

Thank you for considering my perspective.

Wenhan Fan
fwh294941639@gmail.com

2809 Cebu Pl

Carlsbad , California 92009

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Jisung Park <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 6:16 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - reject the ordinance or exempt airport land

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Hello, I recently completed my PPL in Palomar airport and think it's a very good school. Every year, about 30 people from my university in Korea come here for flight training. It is much more affordable here than in Korea and the quality is better. We hope our school will still be here for future years.

Please vote for option 2C to REJECT the proposed drafts of the Working Families Ordinance.

If you do choose to approve an ordinance, please include the airport exemption language proposed by the Gillespie Pilots Association.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

Should you choose to go forward with a version of this ordinance, I ask that you include an amendment so that if the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

Thank you for considering my perspective.

Jisung Park
2000parkjs@naver.com
1562 Pearl Heights Rd
Vista, California 92081



Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Huiram Choi <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 6:24 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - reject the ordinance or exempt airport land

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Hello,

Please vote for option 2C to REJECT the proposed drafts of the Working Families Ordinance.

If you do choose to approve an ordinance, please include the airport exemption language proposed by the Gillespie Pilots Association.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

Should you choose to go forward with a version of this ordinance, I ask that you include an amendment so that if the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

Thank you for considering my perspective.

Huiram Choi
sxsx3165a@gmail.com
1562 Pearl Heights Rd
Vista, California 92081

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Gyeongseo Yun <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 6:31 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - reject the ordinance or exempt airport land

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Dear Supervisors,

The people who own and teach at my school work very hard. They work long hours and also work on weekends to help us finish our training. I am told that they will stop accepting our students and close the school if they have to do this new ordinance.

Please vote for option 2C to REJECT the proposed drafts of the Working Families Ordinance.

If you do choose to approve an ordinance, please include the airport exemption language proposed by the Gillespie Pilots Association.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

Should you choose to go forward with a version of this ordinance, I ask that you include an amendment so that if the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

Thank you for considering my perspective.

Gyeongseo Yun
rudtj281@gmail.com

1562 Pearl Heights Rd
Vista, California 92081

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Tae Hyun Gu <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 6:34 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - reject the ordinance or exempt airport land

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Please vote for option 2C to REJECT the proposed drafts of the Working Families Ordinance.

If you do choose to approve an ordinance, please include the airport exemption language proposed by the Gillespie Pilots Association.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

Should you choose to go forward with a version of this ordinance, I ask that you include an amendment so that if the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

Thank you for considering my perspective.

Tae Hyun Gu
gu77889@naver.com
2809 Cebu Pl
Carlsbad, California 92009

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 6:50 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: Fwd: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Jim Wright <jimwright.fly@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 5:19 PM
To: Vargas, Nora; Anderson, Joel; Lawson-Remer, Terra; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS); Desmond, Jim
Cc: Eldridge, Lonnie; Robbins-Meyer, Helen; Potter, Andrew; Medved, Marko
Subject: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

Dear Chairman Fletcher and members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am urging you to please REJECT the ordinance. The unintended negative consequences to our county airports and east county businesses adds to the financial struggles they already face. I'm a pilot and aircraft owner based at Gillespie and I am all too aware of the struggles our small businesses already face. Please, lets not make things even more difficult for them, in the end it hurts us all.

Sincerely,

James M. Wright
12503 Alcaccer Del Sol
San Diego, CA 92128
Jimwright.fly@gmail.com

Sent from my iPad

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 6:50 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: Fwd: PLEASE REJECT THE WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

From: wes morris <jwesmorris@outlook.com>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 5:23 PM
To: Vargas, Nora; Anderson, Joel; Lawson-Remer, Terra; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS); Desmond, Jim
Cc: Eldridge, Lonnie; Robbins-Meyer, Helen; Potter, Andrew; Medved, Marko
Subject: [External] PLEASE REJECT THE WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

Dear Chairman Fletcher and members of the Board of Supervisors,

I have lived in San Diego County my entire life and have seen first-hand what a great, diverse, community we have.

In the late '80's I realized aviation was a real goal anyone could aspire too, not just something for the "rich and famous". I started working for different small businesses at Gillespie Field and ultimately earned enough to get married and start a family. Though I later followed a career outside aviation, I stayed connected and supported the small business that "gave me a break" and helped me develop into the family-man I am today. I really do owe something to the traditional "small business" where so many like myself have started out and many others have continued to thrive. These types of businesses truly are the economic and social backbone of any community.

That's why I am writing to urge you to NOT adopt the proposed Working Families Ordinance - however, if you do, PLEASE EXEMPT all County Airports to ensure continued air safety and FAA grant funding.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

I am urging you to amend the ordinance that when the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

I thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Wes Morris
Rancho San Diego resident

Sent from my iPhone

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 6:50 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: Fwd: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

From: Rich Martindell <rich.martindell@earthlink.net>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 5:34 PM
To: Vargas, Nora; Anderson, Joel; Lawson-Remer, Terra; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS); Desmond, Jim
Cc: Eldridge, Lonnie; Robbins-Meyer, Helen; Potter, Andrew; Medved, Marko
Subject: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

Dear Chairman Fletcher and members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to NOT adopt the proposed Working Families Ordinance - however, if you do, PLEASE EXEMPT all County Airports to ensure continued air safety and FAA grant funding.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

I am urging you to amend the ordinance that when the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

I thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Richard Martindell
1434 Marshall Rd, Unit 4
Alpine, CA 91901
619-253-7649
www.wild-blue-yonder.com
Sent from my iPad

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 6:51 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: Fwd: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

From: Ghassan Jalal <ghassan.fahim@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 5:43 PM
To: Vargas, Nora; Anderson, Joel; Lawson-Remer, Terra; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS); Desmond, Jim
Cc: Eldridge, Lonnie; Robbins-Meyer, Helen; Potter, Andrew; Medved, Marko
Subject: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

Dear Chairman Fletcher and members of the Board of Supervisors,

Please I don't want to loose my job, I'm 62 years old and being working at an FBO at Gillespie Field and I'm sure this business can not afford it and they will close the business or bankruptcy

I am writing to urge you to NOT adopt the proposed Working Families Ordinance - however, if you do, PLEASE EXEMPT all County Airports to ensure continued air safety and FAA grant funding.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

I am urging you to amend the ordinance that when the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

I thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Ghassan F Jalal
400 Witherspoon Way
El Cajon, CA 92020
619-414-8673

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 6:51 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: Fwd: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

From: Karl Gobel <karlgobel@mac.com>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 5:43 PM
To: Vargas, Nora; Anderson, Joel; Lawson-Remer, Terra; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS); Desmond, Jim
Cc: Eldridge, Lonnie; Robbins-Meyer, Helen; Potter, Andrew; Medved, Marko
Subject: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

Dear Chairman Fletcher and members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to NOT adopt the proposed Working Families Ordinance - however, if you do, PLEASE EXEMPT all County Airports to ensure continued air safety and FAA grant funding.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

I am urging you to amend the ordinance that when the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

I thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Karl C Gobel

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 6:51 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: Fwd: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

From: Julian Morales <juliancito96@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 5:48 PM
To: Vargas, Nora; Anderson, Joel; Lawson-Remer, Terra; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS); Desmond, Jim
Cc: Eldridge, Lonnie; Robbins-Meyer, Helen; Potter, Andrew; Medved, Marko
Subject: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

Dear Chairman Fletcher and members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to NOT adopt the proposed Working Families Ordinance - however, if you do, PLEASE EXEMPT all County Airports to ensure continued air safety and FAA grant funding.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

I am urging you to amend the ordinance that when the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

I thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Julian Morales

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 6:51 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: Fwd: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

From: Kathryn <kldreyer@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 6:16 PM
To: Vargas, Nora; Anderson, Joel; Lawson-Remer, Terra; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS); Desmond, Jim
Cc: Eldridge, Lonnie; Robbins-Meyer, Helen; Potter, Andrew; Medved, Marko
Subject: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

Dear Chairman Fletcher and members of the Board of Supervisors,

I oppose Ordinance 73.11 because it's bad policy. Just the threat of ordinance 73.11 has already cost East County over 400 jobs. Every economic study says that ordinance 73.11 will cause lost jobs. How much economic damage are you willing to inflict on an area that is already economically depressed? Your own economic study indicates that this ordinance will cause a total loss of over 21 million dollars to the County's economy including tax revenues. Why would you risk causing so much harm to our economy?

Yes, other jurisdictions have instituted similar ordinances and they have also lost a huge number of jobs and tax revenues because of it. All the typographic errors in the latest versions of the ordinance is evidence that you are rushing this through without due diligence. Please stop the madness and reject this destructive ordinance.

Kathryn Dreyer
4197 South Tropic Dr.
La Mesa, Ca 91941

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Greg Finch <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 6:56 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - reject the ordinance or exempt airport land

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Please vote for option 2C to REJECT the proposed drafts of the Working Families Ordinance.

If you do choose to approve an ordinance, please include the airport exemption language proposed by the Gillespie Pilots Association.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

Should you choose to go forward with a version of this ordinance, I ask that you include an amendment so that if the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

Thank you for considering my perspective.

Greg Finch
grefin7@icloud.com
2832 Laning Road
San Diego, California 92106

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Gijung Kim <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 6:58 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - reject the ordinance or exempt airport land

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Please vote for option 2C to REJECT the proposed drafts of the Working Families Ordinance.

If you do choose to approve an ordinance, please include the airport exemption language proposed by the Gillespie Pilots Association.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

Should you choose to go forward with a version of this ordinance, I ask that you include an amendment so that if the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

Thank you for considering my perspective.

Gijung Kim
kingijung69@gmail.com
1562 Pearl Heights Rd
Vista, California 92081

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 7:50 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: Fwd: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

From: Kathryn <kldreyer@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 6:16 PM
To: Vargas, Nora; Anderson, Joel; Lawson-Remer, Terra; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS); Desmond, Jim
Cc: Eldridge, Lonnie; Robbins-Meyer, Helen; Potter, Andrew; Medved, Marko
Subject: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

Dear Chairman Fletcher and members of the Board of Supervisors,

I oppose Ordinance 73.11 because it's bad policy. Just the threat of ordinance 73.11 has already cost East County over 400 jobs. Every economic study says that ordinance 73.11 will cause lost jobs. How much economic damage are you willing to inflict on an area that is already economically depressed? Your own economic study indicates that this ordinance will cause a total loss of over 21 million dollars to the County's economy including tax revenues. Why would you risk causing so much harm to our economy?

Yes, other jurisdictions have instituted similar ordinances and they have also lost a huge number of jobs and tax revenues because of it. All the typographic errors in the latest versions of the ordinance is evidence that you are rushing this through without due diligence. Please stop the madness and reject this destructive ordinance.

George Dreyer
4197 South Tropic Dr.
La Mesa, Ca 91941

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 7:50 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: Fwd: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

From: Greg Finch <grefin7@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 6:43 PM
To: Vargas, Nora; Anderson, Joel; Lawson-Remer, Terra; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS); Desmond, Jim
Cc: Eldridge, Lonnie; Robbins-Meyer, Helen; Potter, Andrew; Medved, Marko
Subject: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

Dear Chairman Fletcher and members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to NOT adopt the proposed Working Families Ordinance - however, if you do, PLEASE EXEMPT all County Airports to ensure continued air safety and FAA grant funding.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

I am urging you to amend the ordinance that when the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

I thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Greg Finch

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Robin Gartman <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 7:50 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - reject the ordinance or exempt airport land

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

I'm retired, my hobby is flying, yet I won't be able to afford to rent an airplane if this ordinance is passed. The trickle-down effects of this proposed economic disaster will crush general aviation within the county of San Diego. County airports depend on the commerce that surrounds them, this ordinance will damage that life source.

Economic studies were conducted for a reason, read them and find the truth. Realize that what you are about to do will hurt each city that supports a county airport. Save your county by saving the cities within and table this ordinance for now. Please do more research and get this right.

Please vote for option 2C to REJECT the proposed drafts of the Working Families Ordinance. It is your lack of transparency on this matter to all the citizens within the county that reminds me of the prior County board of supervisors. I really thought you were going to be different. So please vote for Option 2C.

If you do choose to approve an ordinance, please include the airport exemption language proposed by the Gillespie Pilots Association.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

Should you choose to go forward with a version of this ordinance, I ask that you include an amendment so that if the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

Thank you for considering my perspective.

Robin Gartman

Robingartman84@gmail.com

2725 Anta Ct

Carlsbad, California 92009

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 7:51 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: Fwd: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

From: Bob Antebi <bobantebi@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 7:32 PM
To: Fletcher, Nathan (BOS); Desmond, Jim; Anderson, Joel; Vargas, Nora; Lawson-Remer, Terra
Cc: Potter, Andrew; Eldridge, Lonnie; Robbins-Meyer, Helen; Medved, Marko
Subject: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

Dear Chairman Fletcher and members of the Board of Supervisors,

I run a 501(c)3 non-profit public benefit charity based at Gillespie Field that provides unmanned aircraft pilot training to First Responder and Public Safety agencies and job training to the general public.

I am writing to urge you to NOT adopt the proposed Working Families Ordinance - however, if you do, PLEASE EXEMPT all County Airports to ensure continued air safety and FAA grant funding.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, or no employees at all, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance and pilot training. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

I am urging you to amend the ordinance that when the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

I thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Bob Antebi
Pacific Drone Academy, Inc.
1783 N Marshall Ave
El Canon, CA 92020

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 7:51 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: Fwd: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

From: Samantha Stratton <samantha1stratton@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 7:41 PM
To: Vargas, Nora; Anderson, Joel; Lawson-Remer, Terra; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS); Desmond, Jim
Cc: Eldridge, Lonnie; Robbins-Meyer, Helen; Potter, Andrew; Medved, Marko
Subject: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

Dear Chairman Fletcher and members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to NOT adopt the proposed Working Families Ordinance - however, if you do, PLEASE EXEMPT all County Airports to ensure continued air safety and FAA grant funding.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

I am urging you to amend the ordinance that when the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

I thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

YOUR NAME HERE

Sent from my iPhone

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 8:06 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: Fwd: [External] Request to reject Working Families Ordinance

From: Widay <awiday@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 7:45 PM
To: Vargas, Nora; Anderson, Joel; Lawson-Remer, Terra; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS); Desmond, Jim
Cc: Eldridge, Lonnie; Robbins-Meyer, Helen; Potter, Andrew; Medved, Marko
Subject: [External] Request to reject Working Families Ordinance

I was recently made aware of details of the Working Families Ordinance that is under consideration. While the intent is likely good the execution as outlined is terrible.

Among the many concerns is the mandatory requirement to use union labor on all projects. That is grossly unfair to small businesses and people who might not want to be forced to join a union and pay the union to work.

The special hourly wages, required extra benefits, etc. will drive businesses away from private businesses located on county properties - including many small and family businesses that have operated for years at the many county airports.

Additionally, providing the mandatory wages, benefits, etc. to independent contractors might put businesses in violation of California's Independent Contractor Laws. Treating independent contractors like employees is a violation! That could result in problems at a State and Federal regulatory level.

There is already a business exodus from California. If this is implemented it will only push more businesses away and prevent development and new businesses.

I am a native San Diegan. My husband is a retired Navy pilot. We have lived above Gillespie Field for over 20 years. Sadly, Buck Knives and other companies have been taxed, priced and policed out of the area or out of business.

Let the State and Federal government set uniform rules and regulations that apply to all - please don't micromanage away businesses on San Diego County land!

Ann Widay
Hacienda Dr.
El Cajon
619-884-9334

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Ellen Kutzler <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 8:14 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - reject the ordinance or exempt airport land

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Please vote for option 2C to REJECT the proposed drafts of the Working Families Ordinance.

If you do choose to approve an ordinance, please include the airport exemption language proposed by the Gillespie Pilots Association.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

Should you choose to go forward with a version of this ordinance, I ask that you include an amendment so that if the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

Thank you for considering my perspective.

Ellen Kutzler
ellenkutzler@gmail.com
11979 Calle Limonero
El Cajon, California 92019

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Brian Posse <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 9:47 PM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - reject the ordinance or exempt airport land

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Please vote for option 2C to REJECT the proposed drafts of the Working Families Ordinance.

Several economic impact studies (including the one commissioned by the County of San Diego) show that this is a bad idea that will kill local small businesses and generally make everything more expensive.

If you do choose to approve an ordinance, please include the airport exemption language proposed by the Gillespie Pilots Association.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

Should you choose to go forward with a version of this ordinance, I ask that you include an amendment so that if the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

Thank you for considering my perspective.

Brian Posse
xxelpresidente@aol.com
1562 Pearl Heights Rd
Vista, California 92081

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Chin Tu <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 12:52 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] I have a story to tell that started half century ago related to Item 17 - reject the ordinance or exempt airport land

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Please vote for option 2C to REJECT the proposed drafts of the Working Families Ordinance. That said, here is the story. I came to America in 1965 as a young immigrant at 16 years old. Immediately I started to work on my dream to become a pilot. I went into US Army Aviation with a airplane license in 1970 but end up flying helicopters. I came home from Vietnam went to work for Hughes Helicopters here at Palomar airport, Carlsbad as production test pilot and transport pilot. After the world famous Apache helicopter did it's first ever hover flight here at taxiway Alpha 4 at Palomar airport, Hughes Helicopter was absorbed by McDonnell Douglas which was absorbed by Boeing Co. soon after the entire operation moved to Mesa, Arizona. That was the year of 1986. I took a layoff, stayed here at Palomar airport kept the tradition of helicopter presence here at Palomar airport and started my own company, Civic Helicopters. Inc.

Soon enough, I started to train pilots from all walks of life. San Diego Sheriff's Department and San Diego Police Department both have attended my training school in the past and currently. In addition, being the only FAA certified Part 141 helicopter flight training school in San Diego, I am able to serve active service members and veterans from military bases in San Diego North Island, Marimar and Camp Pendleton, who are either building their flying career or transition from military into civilian certificates for their civilian flying jobs. In the 36 years here at Palomar airport, Civic as a small veteran and minority owned business, we have been fulfilling our commitment of "Saving one pilot at a time!" Our contribution to helicopter flight safety here in San Diego.

Through out the years here at Palomar airport, Civic have employed hundreds of admin staff, trained and transitioned military air-frame and power plant mechanics, transitioned military pilots as our staffs, supported military/civilian contracts at discounted rate. Currently we are supporting the Test pilot training program at Edwards Air Force base at a discounted rate.

Civic has an average of 10 to 15 employs working between part time and full time. In order to make this small business to work, my whole family has to pitch in to make ends meet, from

payroll to payroll, sometimes it is a bet of challenging. Many times I have to resort to take on additional duties in order to make things work.

Then 2020 hit us like Corona-virus. Everything turned upside down. However, there is no substitute for learning to fly helicopter in a helicopter! Employees are quarantined, equipment needs to be maintained, student pilots need to finish their training and go back to their units or go home in overseas. The buck stops here on the shoulders of owners.

When I was 40 years old, I can make this happen. I will be 74 years old in 1 month and I am fixing toilet, change locks, fixing gate, maintain helicopters, repair roof, fixing fuel trucks, pay bills, teaching emergency recovery procedures in helicopters to all pilots, sweeping floor to keep the facility clean, water the plants, trim the trees and to write letters to you to let you know, in order for me to hire more people to help me out in this competitive, no worker environment, I will have to pay the market rate or perhaps more than market rate in order to attract qualified people. I do not need anymore regulations to mandate or manipulate the free market. There are always unintended consequences from unneeded rules or regulations. Please do not be the last straw added on this old camel's back, so I can hire more people to help the aviation community out, to help our service members and veterans out. Maybe I can retire for the 5th time and don't have to come back and to keep this essential business going.

I urge you to vote Option 2C. If you do choose to approve this ordinance, hope not, please include the airport exemption language proposed by the Gillespie Pilots Association.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. They explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Or the land sits there empty. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County and by other stakeholders.

Should you choose to go forward with a version of this ordinance, I ask that you include an amendment so that if the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under this ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

Thank you for reading my story and considering my perspective point of view.

Respectfully,

Chin Yi Tu

Owner and Operator

Civic Helicopters Inc.

760-438-8424

Chin Tu

chinyitu@gmail.com

2206 Palomar Airport Road

Carlsbad, California 92011

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Chin Tu <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 1:00 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] I have a story to tell that started half century ago related to Item 17 - reject the ordinance or exempt airport land

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

To Chair Nathan Fletcher

To Supervisor Jim Desmond

To Supervisor Joel Anderson

To Board Clerk Andrew Potter

To Supervisor Nora Vargas

To Supervisor Terra Lawson-Remer

I have a story to tell that started half a century ago related to Item 17 - reject the ordinance or exempt airport land

Please vote for option 2C to REJECT the proposed drafts of the Working Families Ordinance. That said, here is the story. I came to America in 1965 as a young immigrant at 16 years old. Immediately I started to work on my dream to become a pilot. I went into US Army Aviation with a airplane license in 1970 but end up flying helicopters. I came home from Vietnam went to work for Hughes Helicopters here at Palomar airport, Carlsbad as production test pilot and transport pilot. After the world-famous Apache helicopter did its first ever hover flight here at taxiway Alpha 4 at Palomar airport, Hughes Helicopter was absorbed by McDonnell Douglas which was absorbed by Boeing Co. soon after the entire operation moved to Mesa, Arizona. That was the year of 1986. I took a layoff, stayed here at Palomar airport kept the tradition of helicopter presence here at Palomar airport and started my own company, Civic Helicopters. Inc.

Soon enough, I started to train pilots from all walks of life. San Diego Sheriff's Department and San Diego Police Department both have attended my training school in the past and currently. In addition, being the only FAA certified Part 141 helicopter flight training school in San Diego, I am able to serve active service members and veterans from military bases in San Diego North Island, Miramar and Camp Pendleton, who are either building their flying career or transition from military into civilian certificates for their civilian flying jobs. In the 36 years here at Palomar airport, Civic as a small veteran and minority owned business, we

have been fulfilling our commitment of "Saving one pilot at a time!" Our contribution to helicopter flight safety here in San Diego.

Throughout the years here at Palomar airport, Civic have employed hundreds of admin staff, trained and transitioned military air-frame and power plant mechanics, transitioned military pilots as our staffs, supported military/civilian contracts at discounted rate. Currently we are supporting the Test pilot training program at Edwards Air Force base at a discounted rate.

Civic has an average of 10 to 15 employs working between part time and full time. In order to make this small business to work, my whole family has to pitch in to make ends meet, from payroll to payroll, sometimes it is a bet of challenging. Many times, I have to resort to take on additional duties in order to make things work.

Then 2020 hit us like Coronavirus. Everything turned upside down. However, there is no substitute for learning to fly helicopter in a helicopter! Employees are quarantined, equipment needs to be maintained, student pilots need to finish their training and go back to their units or go home in overseas. The buck stops here on the shoulders of owners.

When I was 40 years old, I can make this happen. I will be 74 years old in 1 month and I am fixing toilet, change locks, fixing gate, maintain helicopters, repair roof, fixing fuel trucks, pay bills, teaching emergency recovery procedures in helicopters to all pilots, sweeping floor to keep the facility clean, water the plants, trim the trees and to write letters to you to let you know, in order for me to hire more people to help me out in this competitive, no worker environment, I will have to pay the market rate or perhaps more than market rate in order to attract qualified people. I do not need any more regulations to mandate or manipulate the free market. There are always unintended consequences from unneeded rules or regulations. Please do not be the last straw added on this old camel's back, so I can hire more people to help the aviation community out, to help our service members and veterans out. Maybe I can retire for the 5th time and don't have to come back and to keep th is essential business going.

I urge you to vote Option 2C. If you do choose to approve this ordinance, hope not, please include the airport exemption language proposed by the Gillespie Pilots Association.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. They explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Or the land sits there empty. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County and by other stakeholders.

Should you choose to go forward with a version of this ordinance, I ask that you include an amendment so that if the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under this ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

Thank you for reading my story and considering my perspective point of view.

Respectfully,

Chin Yi Tu
Owner and Operator
Civic Helicopters Inc.
760-438-8424

Chin Tu
chinyitu@gmail.com
2206 Palomar Airport Road
Carlsbad, California 92011

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Donald Eccker <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 5:45 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - reject the ordinance or exempt airport land

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Please vote for option 2C to REJECT the proposed drafts of the Working Families Ordinance.

Mr Fletcher, you on occasion take your family to the Barnstorm Restaurant in Big Bear. Just imagine if you took your family to the Gillespie field cafe and had to pay \$100 for your breakfast because of the wages the owners would have to pay their waiters, dishwashers, etc. under your ordinance and need to pass on to survive. I'm a Retired navy Aviation mechanic Vietnam veteran on limited income. This ordinance would destroy any businesses on airport property's include any part time jobs I would manage to get. PLEASE DONT .no good will come of this ordinance.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

Should you choose to go forward with a version of this ordinance, I ask that you include an amendment so that if the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

Thank you for considering my perspective.

Donald Eccker
eccckers@cox.net
1356 Oakleaf lane
Ramona, California 92065

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Carlos Camacho <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:06 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - Rechacen la ley o eximir los terrenos aeronáuticos

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Voten para la opción 2C para RECHAZAR ambas versiones de la ley propuesta.

Si deciden aprobar la ley, incluyan la lenguaje de exención para los terrenos aeronauticos.

Sabemos que si aprueban la nueva ley, los negocios no podrán seguir operando.

Gracias por considerar mi opinión.

Carlos Camacho
ccamacho@altmanplants.com
2575 Olive Hill Rd
Fallbrook, California 92028

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Richard Gulden <richard.mgulden@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:37 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] 2/8/2022 Public comment attachment Agenda item 16
Attachments: Rapid test proposal.txt

Attached proposal for use of Rapid Antigen Testing submitted.

Thank You

Richard M Gulden

I propose adding a line item on this agenda item #16 and vote on it separately.

I propose we spend \$10 million now for the purpose of acquiring Rapid Antigen Tests and converting all county testing sites to combined PCR testing and rapid test and trace PODS. The reason we need to do this is to enable rapid tracing, rapid isolation, efficiency of testing, equity of rapid tests, and to significantly reduce the prevalence of the virus and the need for the more expensive PCR testing. We need to be doing an average of 10,000 daily rapid tests, but can begin with as little as 2,000.

What changes would need to be made to existing county run test centers? About 4 additional staff would be required depending on the size of the test center. These include people to screen to see who should get rapid tests, rapid test administrators, and personnel to ensure immediate isolation, contact tracing, and temporary lodging begins if required. A cabana with 3 tables and 6 chairs should be set up maybe 10 yards from where the PCR test samples are being taken. People continue to schedule their tests through the county and end up going through LHI care, or healthbook scheduler. At the beginning due to limited availability nobody schedules rapid tests, they get screened at the site if they are a good candidate for our most valuable testing resources.

Why does the county need to run the Rapid antigen tests? These tests are being largely misused on the lowest priority to test individuals. There is no QA to ensure tests are properly conducted. There is no automatic reporting, and no immediate isolation and tracing. People don't understand when to test relative to their exposure or symptom onset and are getting false negatives too often. People are using them for the wrong purpose and acting like they are immunity passports and engaging in high risk activities as a result. The county can fix these items with 10,000 tests per day.

Who is prioritized for rapid testing? The prevalence of the virus, testing demand, and the quantity of available county rapid tests for a given day determines what priority tiers will get rapid tests that day. All others have to either get PCR tested, buy their own rapid tests, or get them elsewhere. The priorities should be set up like similarly to the original testing instruction from 2020 with 6 priority tiers briefly described as follows.

Tier 1: Symptomatic individuals less than 72 hours symptomatic where rapid testing would provide beneficial information to help with early isolation and contact tracing. These include most potential cluster and outbreak situations, as well as other probable cases where there was significant chance of

further spread.

Tier 2: Symptomatic individuals less than 72 hours symptomatic where rapid testing is needed to facilitate early treatment.

Tier 3: Healthcare worker and other designated frontline worker testing for return to work following isolation or quarantine. Surveillance testing of schools where there are possible ongoing outbreaks. Key contact of case surveillance testing where there is likelihood of further spread if they are infected.

Tier 4: All other symptomatic testing and certain necessary work related travel where there are testing requirements.

Tier 5: All other public health surveillance testing.

Tier 6: All other testing.

What types of tests should be purchased? We should contract with 4 different manufacturers to ensure that if new variants arise and we find some tests don't work as well we can continue the program. 80% of what we purchase should be in bulk with 20% in individual packs.

Can people take them home? In rare instances yes. If it is for the right purposes the test center should give them a test to have them test 24 hours from now and report the results.

I urge all supervisors to propose and support 1 additional item in agenda item 16 and get Rapid Antigen Testing test and trace PODS up and operational as soon as possible. Start by voting on allocating \$10 million for the initial supplies.

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:45 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: FW: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

From: Ellen Kutzler <ellenkutzler@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 8:16 PM
To: Vargas, Nora <Nora.Vargas@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS) <Nathan.Fletcher@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Cc: Eldridge, Lonnie <Lonnie.Eldridge@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Robbins-Meyer, Helen <Helen.Robbins-Meyer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Potter, Andrew <Andrew.Potter@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Medved, Marko <Marko.Medved@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Subject: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

Dear Chairman Fletcher and members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to NOT adopt the proposed Working Families Ordinance - however, if you do, PLEASE EXEMPT all County Airports to ensure continued air safety and FAA grant funding.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

I am urging you to amend the ordinance that when the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

This will have negative impacts on several small businesses we rely on.

I thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Ellen Kutzler

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:45 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: FW: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

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

From: Tina Behle <tina.behle@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 8:23 PM
To: Vargas, Nora <Nora.Vargas@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS) <Nathan.Fletcher@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Cc: Eldridge, Lonnie <Lonnie.Eldridge@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Robbins-Meyer, Helen <Helen.Robbins-Meyer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Potter, Andrew <Andrew.Potter@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Medved, Marko <Marko.Medved@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Subject: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

Dear Chairman Fletcher and members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to NOT adopt the proposed Working Families Ordinance - however, if you do, PLEASE EXEMPT all County Airports to ensure continued air safety and FAA grant funding.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

I am urging you to amend the ordinance that when the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

I thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Tina Behle

Sent from my iPhone

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:45 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: FW: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

From: Kevin Churchill <kcinencinitas@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 8:25 PM
To: Vargas, Nora <Nora.Vargas@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS) <Nathan.Fletcher@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Cc: Eldridge, Lonnie <Lonnie.Eldridge@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Robbins-Meyer, Helen <Helen.Robbins-Meyer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Potter, Andrew <Andrew.Potter@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Medved, Marko <Marko.Medved@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Subject: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

Dear Chairman Fletcher and members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to NOT adopt the proposed Working Families Ordinance - however, if you do, PLEASE EXEMPT all County Airports to ensure continued air safety and FAA grant funding.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

I urge you to amend the ordinance such that when the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

I thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,
Kevin Churchill

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:46 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: FW: [External] !! PLEASE !! DO NOT ADOPT THE WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

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

From: Nathan and Lisa Beckermann <nathan.lisa@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 10:49 PM
To: Vargas, Nora <Nora.Vargas@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS) <Nathan.Fletcher@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Cc: Eldridge, Lonnie <Lonnie.Eldridge@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Robbins-Meyer, Helen <Helen.Robbins-Meyer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Potter, Andrew <Andrew.Potter@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Medved, Marko <Marko.Medved@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Subject: [External] !! PLEASE !! DO NOT ADOPT THE WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

Dear Chairman Fletcher and members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am currently employed at Gillespie Field as an aircraft mechanic. I love my work and enjoy it thoroughly. I do not need a pay raise, nor do my colleagues. We simply would like to keep our jobs, and realize that with your proposed ordinance, our livelihoods are at risk.

I am writing to urge you to NOT adopt the proposed Working Families Ordinance. Many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

I am urging you to reject the ordinance. As our representatives, please listen to the people who elected you.

I thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Nathan Kapitaniuk
(619)-454 2899

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:46 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: FW: PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

From: David Rubin <RubinD@Mirati.com>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 11:17 PM
To: Vargas, Nora <Nora.Vargas@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS) <Nathan.Fletcher@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Cc: Eldridge, Lonnie <Lonnie.Eldridge@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Robbins-Meyer, Helen <Helen.Robbins-Meyer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Potter, Andrew <Andrew.Potter@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Medved, Marko <Marko.Medved@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Subject: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

Dear Chairman Fletcher and members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to NOT adopt the proposed Working Families Ordinance - however, if you do, PLEASE EXEMPT all County Airports to ensure continued air safety and FAA grant funding.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

I am urging you to amend the ordinance that when the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

I thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Albert Rubin

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:46 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: FW: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

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

From: Dena Hartsuyker <dihartsuyker@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 1:15 AM
To: Vargas, Nora <Nora.Vargas@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS) <Nathan.Fletcher@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Cc: Eldridge, Lonnie <Lonnie.Eldridge@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Robbins-Meyer, Helen <Helen.Robbins-Meyer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Potter, Andrew <Andrew.Potter@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Medved, Marko <Marko.Medved@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Subject: [External] PLEASE EXEMPT AIRPORTS FROM WORKING FAMILIES' ORDINANCE

Dear Chairman Fletcher and members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to NOT adopt the proposed Working Families Ordinance - however, if you do, PLEASE EXEMPT all County Airports to ensure continued air safety and FAA grant funding.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

I am urging you to amend the ordinance that when the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

I thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Dena Hartsuyker

Sent from my iPhone

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:46 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: FW: Save Jobs on County Land - Stop the "Working Families Ordinance"

From: Jeremy Dentt <jeremy@denttprop.com>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 11:23 PM
To: Vargas, Nora <Nora.Vargas@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS) <Nathan.Fletcher@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Cc: Eldridge, Lonnie <Lonnie.Eldridge@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Robbins-Meyer, Helen <Helen.Robbins-Meyer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Potter, Andrew <Andrew.Potter@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Medved, Marko <Marko.Medved@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Subject: [External] Save Jobs on County Land - Stop the "Working Families Ordinance"
Importance: High

Good evening, I recently completed the development 65,000 square feet of Commercial Industrial & mid construction on another 50,000 square feet in the Gillespie Field Business Park. I negotiated a 50 year lease contract with the County of San Diego and invested over \$15 million into the property. My ground lease over the next 50 years will pay the county millions of dollars in ground rent. The cost of the ground rent is covered by the rents I receive from my sub-lessees.

This proposed Work Force Housing Ordinance is and will have a major impact on my ability to lease and pay my ground rent to the County. My tenants leases range from 1-5 years, all of my tenants have stated they will relocate to another property down the street and outside the influence if this should it go into effect. We are now trying to lease Phase II however businesses are reluctant to sign a lease knowing they could be subject to this ordinance.

You are the Lessor with rights to collections per the contract and now you as the Lessor are trying to implementing laws that will eliminate my ability to sub-lease spaces to cover your rent.

This ordinance severely hurts the hourly wage earners since it is one of the few mass transit served industrial / commercial areas. The Gillespie Field Trolley stop is walkable to over a million square feet of industrial commercial including large employers like Taylor Guitar and GKN.

I ask you exclude Airport Lands from this ordinance it will reduce the County collections from Ground Rent, decimate the City of El Cajon's employment lands and takes away mass transit access for employees.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best,

Jeremy Dentt
Dentt Properties Inc
858-472-0783

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:46 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: FW: Save Jobs on County Land - Stop the "Working Families Ordinance"

From: Skip Tschantz <stschantz@divprop.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:39 AM
To: Vargas, Nora <Nora.Vargas@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS) <Nathan.Fletcher@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Cc: Eldridge, Lonnie <Lonnie.Eldridge@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Robbins-Meyer, Helen <Helen.Robbins-Meyer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Potter, Andrew <Andrew.Potter@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Medved, Marko <Marko.Medved@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Skip Tschantz <stschantz@divprop.net>
Subject: [External] Re: Save Jobs on County Land - Stop the "Working Families Ordinance"

Good morning,

As a long-standing Master Ground Lessee of County owned property at Gillespie Field I am writing to register my position against the proposed Working Families Ordinance. Various entities owned and managed by Diversified Properties are the Lessees of 11 properties within the Gillespie Field Business Park (Cuyamaca West Phases I and II) ("Business Park") which date back to 1991. The project has been a significant success in terms of getting the Cuyamaca West subdivision off the ground as it had been sitting for many years without any interest from potential developers or users.

Diversified Properties took significant risks during those early days as the country was in recession in the early 90's and access to financing for development was almost non-existent. The first building to be constructed was a build to suit for Taylor Guitars at 1940 Gillespie Way. This project was built with private financing and investor capital as conventional financing was not available, especially for properties on unsubordinated ground leases. At that time Taylor Guitars was a small and undercapitalized company that had outgrown its 10,000 SF facility in Santee, requiring us to take a significant risk to get this business park off the ground. Taylor is now an international success as the premier acoustic guitar manufacturer in the world and currently occupies 7 buildings within the Business Park. To date we have invested in excess of \$25,000,000 in the physical improvements to various properties within the Business Park and paid the County in excess of \$11,000,000 in ground rent over the past 30 years.

In those early days we worked very closely with County staff as well as Supervisor Jacob to bring about a first-class business park development that had the potential of raising the bar and attracting significant users/employers to the area. The results speak for themselves with more than 600,000 SF of first class industrial and office product in a master planned and architecturally controlled environment. This is a project that the County of San Diego, City of El Cajon and Diversified Properties, as well as other ground lessees within the Business Park, should be very proud of. It has been a true joint effort and accomplishment of significant proportions and with significant benefits to the local community including the County and the City of El Cajon.

With this as a backdrop, it was a sad day when we were first made aware of the proposed Working Families Ordinance. It really took some time to digest the significance of the ordinance and the potential negative impacts to not only our project but to the entire industrial community in El Cajon. This proposed ordinance, or even the potential of it being enacted, is and will continue to have significant negative

impacts on our ability to operate our properties within the Business Park. Existing tenants have already questioned their willingness to renew their leases. We have significant concerns over our ability to market buildings for lease with the cloud of uncertainty that has been brought about by the proposed ordinance and even while attempting to market the property, we will find ourselves competing with other properties in the immediate vicinity that are not subject to this ordinance, leaving us at a significant disadvantage in being able to continue to attract high-quality users.

In short, the proposed ordinance has the real potential of destroying the success and progress of this public/private joint effort development. We implore the Board of Supervisors to either vote against enacting the proposed ordinance or exempt the airport properties from this intrusive, discriminatory ordinance and allow us to continue with operating the Business Park in a first-class manner in future years. We are having a hard time understanding how it is right for our landlord to change the economic terms of a 30-year-old legal contract.

PLEASE VOTE AGAINST THE PROPOSED ORDINANCE OR EXEMPT AIRPORT PROPERTIES.

Sincerely,

SKIP TSCHANTZ

DIVERSIFIED PROPERTIES
505 Lomas Santa Fe Drive
Suite 200
Solana Beach, CA 92075
Office: (619) 258-2900 ext 302
Cell: (858) 945-2375
stschantz@divprop.net
www.diversifiedprop.net



Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:46 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: FW: Save Jobs on County Land - Stop the "Working Families Ordinance"

From: Skip Tschantz <stschantz@divprop.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:39 AM
To: Vargas, Nora <Nora.Vargas@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Anderson, Joel <Joel.Anderson@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Lawson-Remer, Terra <Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS) <Nathan.Fletcher@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Cc: Eldridge, Lonnie <Lonnie.Eldridge@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Robbins-Meyer, Helen <Helen.Robbins-Meyer@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Potter, Andrew <Andrew.Potter@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Medved, Marko <Marko.Medved@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Skip Tschantz <stschantz@divprop.net>
Subject: [External] Re: Save Jobs on County Land - Stop the "Working Families Ordinance"

Good morning,

As a long-standing Master Ground Lessee of County owned property at Gillespie Field I am writing to register my position against the proposed Working Families Ordinance. Various entities owned and managed by Diversified Properties are the Lessees of 11 properties within the Gillespie Field Business Park (Cuyamaca West Phases I and II) ("Business Park") which date back to 1991. The project has been a significant success in terms of getting the Cuyamaca West subdivision off the ground as it had been sitting for many years without any interest from potential developers or users.

Diversified Properties took significant risks during those early days as the country was in recession in the early 90's and access to financing for development was almost non-existent. The first building to be constructed was a build to suit for Taylor Guitars at 1940 Gillespie Way. This project was built with private financing and investor capital as conventional financing was not available, especially for properties on unsubordinated ground leases. At that time Taylor Guitars was a small and undercapitalized company that had outgrown its 10,000 SF facility in Santee, requiring us to take a significant risk to get this business park off the ground. Taylor is now an international success as the premier acoustic guitar manufacturer in the world and currently occupies 7 buildings within the Business Park. To date we have invested in excess of \$25,000,000 in the physical improvements to various properties within the Business Park and paid the County in excess of \$11,000,000 in ground rent over the past 30 years.

In those early days we worked very closely with County staff as well as Supervisor Jacob to bring about a first-class business park development that had the potential of raising the bar and attracting significant users/employers to the area. The results speak for themselves with more than 600,000 SF of first class industrial and office product in a master planned and architecturally controlled environment. This is a project that the County of San Diego, City of El Cajon and Diversified Properties, as well as other ground lessees within the Business Park, should be very proud of. It has been a true joint effort and accomplishment of significant proportions and with significant benefits to the local community including the County and the City of El Cajon.

With this as a backdrop, it was a sad day when we were first made aware of the proposed Working Families Ordinance. It really took some time to digest the significance of the ordinance and the potential negative impacts to not only our project but to the entire industrial community in El Cajon. This proposed ordinance, or even the potential of it being enacted, is and will continue to have significant negative

impacts on our ability to operate our properties within the Business Park. Existing tenants have already questioned their willingness to renew their leases. We have significant concerns over our ability to market buildings for lease with the cloud of uncertainty that has been brought about by the proposed ordinance and even while attempting to market the property, we will find ourselves competing with other properties in the immediate vicinity that are not subject to this ordinance, leaving us at a significant disadvantage in being able to continue to attract high-quality users.

In short, the proposed ordinance has the real potential of destroying the success and progress of this public/private joint effort development. We implore the Board of Supervisors to either vote against enacting the proposed ordinance or exempt the airport properties from this intrusive, discriminatory ordinance and allow us to continue with operating the Business Park in a first-class manner in future years. We are having a hard time understanding how it is right for our landlord to change the economic terms of a 30-year-old legal contract.

PLEASE VOTE AGAINST THE PROPOSED ORDINANCE OR EXEMPT AIRPORT PROPERTIES.

Sincerely,

SKIP TSCHANTZ

DIVERSIFIED PROPERTIES
505 Lomas Santa Fe Drive
Suite 200
Solana Beach, CA 92075
Office: (619) 258-2900 ext 302
Cell: (858) 945-2375
stschantz@divprop.net
www.diversifiedprop.net



Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Troy Perkins <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:47 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - reject the ordinance or exempt airport land

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

My name is Troy Perkins and I am a Private Pilot and aircraft owner hangering my airplane at Gillespie Field.

I do not support the Working Families ordinance and I urge you to reject both versions of the ordinance. However, if you must adopt something, the ordinance should be amended to exclude all FAA grant assurance lands – at all County of San Diego airports.”

Gillespie Field is an economic engine of East County. This ordinance threatens the health of our economy in the surrounding area. It will put people out of work. These laws force employers to pay over burdening wages and benefits. While the aim is to help workers, decades of economic research show that minimum wages and exorbitant benefits usually end up harming workers and the broader economy. Minimum wages particularly stifle job opportunities for the skill lever of the groups that policymakers are often trying to help with these policies.

If the government requires that certain workers be paid higher wages and pay for benefits, then businesses make adjustments to cover the added costs, such as cutting employee work hours, reducing benefits, reducing hiring and raising prices which will cause a decline in business revenue because patrons will do business elsewhere or it will force the business to move or worse, close its doors. None of this helps working families and such a policy change would be damaging especially in today’s sluggish economy.

It should also be considered that this ordinance will cause the County to violate FAA grant assurances. FAA grant funding is crucial for maintaining and improving the airport and airport safety and it is a matter of public safety.

Again I urge you to please vote for Option 2C, to reject both versions of this ordinance.

Thank you for considering my perspective.

Troy Perkins
tscottperkins@gmail.com

6481 Reflection Drive
San Diego, California 92124

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Javier E. Lopez <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:53 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - Rechacen la ley o eximir los terrenos aeronáuticos

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Voten para la opción 2C para RECHAZAR ambas versiones de la ley propuesta.

Si deciden aprobar la ley, incluyan la lenguaje de exención para los terrenos aeronauticos.

Sabemos que si aprueban la nueva ley, los negocios no podrán seguir operando.

Gracias por considerar mi opinión.

Javier E. Lopez
jlopez@altmanplants.com
2575 Olive Hill Rd
Fallbrook, California 92028

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Jesus Ramirez <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:54 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - Rechacen la ley o eximir los terrenos aeronáuticos

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Voten para la opción 2C para RECHAZAR ambas versiones de la ley propuesta.

Si deciden aprobar la ley, incluyan la lenguaje de exención para los terrenos aeronauticos.

Sabemos que si aprueban la nueva ley, los negocios no podrán seguir operando.

Gracias por considerar mi opinión.

Jesus Ramirez
jramirezdos2@gmail.com
2575 olive hills Dr
Fallbrook, California 92028

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Julio Sanchez <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:54 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - Rechacen la ley o eximir los terrenos aeronáuticos

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Voten para la opción 2C para RECHAZAR ambas versiones de la ley propuesta.

Si deciden aprobar la ley, incluyan la lenguaje de exención para los terrenos aeronauticos.

Sabemos que si aprueban la nueva ley, los negocios no podrán seguir operando.

Gracias por considerar mi opinión.

Julio Sanchez
julio94sanchez@gmail.com
2575 Olive Hill Rd
Fallbrook, California 92028

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Alejandra Briseno <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:54 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - Rechacen la ley o eximir los terrenos aeronáuticos

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Voten para la opción 2C para RECHAZAR ambas versiones de la ley propuesta.

Si deciden aprobar la ley, incluyan la lenguaje de exención para los terrenos aeronauticos.

Sabemos que si aprueban la nueva ley, los negocios no podrán seguir operando.

Gracias por considerar mi opinión.

Alejandra Briseno
alexbcervera@icloud.com
2575 olive hill rd
Fallbrook , California 92028

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Elisabet Sanchez's <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:55 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - Rechacen la ley o eximir los terrenos aeronáuticos

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Voten para la opción 2C para RECHAZAR ambas versiones de la ley propuesta.

Si deciden aprobar la ley, incluyan la lenguaje de exención para los terrenos aeronauticos.

Sabemos que si aprueban la nueva ley, los negocios no podrán seguir operando.

Gracias por considerar mi opinión.

Elisabet Sanchez's
elisabet.sanchez@altmanplants.com
2575 Olive Hill Rd
Fallbrook, California 92028

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Miguel Rivera <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:55 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - Rechacen la ley o eximir los terrenos aeronáuticos

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Voten para la opción 2C para RECHAZAR ambas versiones de la ley propuesta.

Si deciden aprobar la ley, incluyan la lenguaje de exención para los terrenos aeronauticos.

Sabemos que si aprueban la nueva ley, los negocios no podrán seguir operando.

Gracias por considerar mi opinión.

Miguel Rivera
miguelri@altmanplants.com
2575 Olive Hill Rd.
Fallbrook, California 92028

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Jesus Cornejo <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:54 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - Rechacen la ley o eximir los terrenos aeronáuticos

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Voten para la opción 2C para RECHAZAR ambas versiones de la ley propuesta.

Si deciden aprobar la ley, incluyan la lenguaje de exención para los terrenos aeronauticos.

Sabemos que si aprueban la nueva ley, los negocios no podrán seguir operando.

Gracias por considerar mi opinión.

Jesus Cornejo
jesuscor@altmanplants.com
2575 olive Hill rd
Fallbrook, California 92028

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Anai Dominguez Mercado <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:55 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - Rechacen la ley o eximir los terrenos aeronáuticos

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Voten para la opción 2C para RECHAZAR ambas versiones de la ley propuesta.

Si deciden aprobar la ley, incluyan la lenguaje de exención para los terrenos aeronauticos.

Sabemos que si aprueban la nueva ley, los negocios no podrán seguir operando.

Gracias por considerar mi opinión.

Anai Dominguez Mercado
aniss2430@gmail.com
2575 Olive Hill Rd
Fallbrook, California 92028

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Eusebio Rojas <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:56 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - Rechacen la ley o eximir los terrenos aeronáuticos

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Voten para la opción 2C para RECHAZAR ambas versiones de la ley propuesta.

Si deciden aprobar la ley, incluyan la lenguaje de exención para los terrenos aeronauticos.

Sabemos que si aprueban la nueva ley, los negocios no podrán seguir operando.

Gracias por considerar mi opinión.

Eusebio Rojas
eusebio.rojas@altmanplants.com
2575 olive hill
FALLBROOK , California 92028

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Carlos Elias <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:56 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - Rechacen la ley o eximir los terrenos aeronáuticos

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Voten para la opción 2C para RECHAZAR ambas versiones de la ley propuesta.

Si deciden aprobar la ley, incluyan la lenguaje de exención para los terrenos aeronauticos.

Sabemos que si aprueban la nueva ley, los negocios no podrán seguir operando.

Gracias por considerar mi opinión.

Carlos Elias
celias@altmanplants.com
2575 olive hill road
Fallbrook , California 92028

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Francisco Ruiz <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:56 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - Rechacen la ley o eximir los terrenos aeronáuticos

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Voten para la opción 2C para RECHAZAR ambas versiones de la ley propuesta.

Si deciden aprobar la ley, incluyan la lenguaje de exención para los terrenos aeronauticos.

Sabemos que si aprueban la nueva ley, los negocios no podrán seguir operando.

Gracias por considerar mi opinión.

Francisco Ruiz

francisco.ruiz@altmanplants.com

2575 splice Hill

Fallbrook , California 92028

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Domitila Cortez <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:56 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - Rechacen la ley o eximir los terrenos aeronáuticos

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Voten para la opción 2C para RECHAZAR ambas versiones de la ley propuesta.

Si deciden aprobar la ley, incluyan la lenguaje de exención para los terrenos aeronauticos.

Sabemos que si aprueban la nueva ley, los negocios no podrán seguir operando.

Gracias por considerar mi opinión.

Domitila Cortez
domitac@altmanplants.com
275 olive hill road
Fallbrook, California 92028

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Edgar Perez <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:57 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - Rechacen la ley o eximir los terrenos aeronáuticos

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Voten para la opción 2C para RECHAZAR ambas versiones de la ley propuesta.

Si deciden aprobar la ley, incluyan la lenguaje de exención para los terrenos aeronauticos.

Sabemos que si aprueban la nueva ley, los negocios no podrán seguir operando.

Gracias por considerar mi opinión.

Edgar Perez
edgarp@altmanplants.com
2575 olive hill rd
Fallbrook, California 92028

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Jose Soto <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:57 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - Rechacen la ley o eximir los terrenos aeronáuticos

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Voten para la opción 2C para RECHAZAR ambas versiones de la ley propuesta.

Si deciden aprobar la ley, incluyan la lenguaje de exención para los terrenos aeronauticos.

Sabemos que si aprueban la nueva ley, los negocios no podrán seguir operando.

Gracias por considerar mi opinión.

Jose Soto
jose.luis.soto@altmanplants.com
2575 olive hill
Fallbrook, California 92028

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Carlos Camacho <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:57 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - Rechacen la ley o eximir los terrenos aeronáuticos

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Voten para la opción 2C para RECHAZAR ambas versiones de la ley propuesta.

Si deciden aprobar la ley, incluyan la lenguaje de exención para los terrenos aeronauticos.

Sabemos que si aprueban la nueva ley, los negocios no podrán seguir operando.

Gracias por considerar mi opinión.

Carlos Camacho
ccamacho@altmanplants.com
2575 Olive Hill Rd
Fallbrook, California 92028

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Miguel Giles <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 8:03 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - Rechacen la ley o eximir los terrenos aeronáuticos

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Voten para la opción 2C para RECHAZAR ambas versiones de la ley propuesta.

Si deciden aprobar la ley, incluyan la lenguaje de exención para los terrenos aeronauticos.

Sabemos que si aprueban la nueva ley, los negocios no podrán seguir operando.

Gracias por considerar mi opinión.

Miguel Giles
miguel.giles@altmanplants.com
2575 Olive Hill
Fallbrook, California 92028

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Maria g Reyes <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 8:06 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - Rechacen la ley o eximir los terrenos aeronáuticos

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Voten para la opción 2C para RECHAZAR ambas versiones de la ley propuesta.

Si deciden aprobar la ley, incluyan la lenguaje de exención para los terrenos aeronauticos.

Sabemos que si aprueban la nueva ley, los negocios no podrán seguir operando.

Gracias por considerar mi opinión.

Maria g Reyes
guiller@altmanplants.com
2575 olive hill rd
Fallbrook, California 92028

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Jeff Provence <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 8:09 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - reject the ordinance or exempt airport land

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Please vote for option 2C to REJECT the proposed drafts of the Working Families Ordinance.

If you do choose to approve an ordinance, please include the airport exemption language proposed by the Gillespie Pilots Association.

At the October 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting, many spoke in opposition to the then-current draft of the Working Families Ordinance. We explained how these employers would be forced to close or move, replacing jobs on County land with other uses that require a minimal number of employees, such as aircraft storage instead of aircraft maintenance. Our concerns have since been corroborated by an economic impact analysis commissioned by the County.

Should you choose to go forward with a version of this ordinance, I ask that you include an amendment so that if the County is the FAA airport sponsor for a property or when FAA grant assurances apply to that property, the property would not be subject to employment standards under the ordinance. The ordinance you adopt would otherwise be in full effect on all County-owned leased land.

Thank you for considering my perspective.

Jeff Provence
jeff@pfsfunds.com
1939 FRIENDSHIP DR Suite C
EL CAJON, California 92020

Vizcarra, Nancy

From: Emilio Benito <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 8:09 AM
To: FGG, Public Comment
Subject: [External] Item 17 - Rechacen la ley o eximir los terrenos aeronáuticos

Board Clerk Andrew Potter,

Voten para la opción 2C para RECHAZAR ambas versiones de la ley propuesta.

Si deciden aprobar la ley, incluyan la lenguaje de exención para los terrenos aeronauticos.

Sabemos que si aprueban la nueva ley, los negocios no podrán seguir operando.

Gracias por considerar mi opinión.

Emilio Benito
ebeninito@altmanplants.com
2575 olive hill rd
Fallbrook , California 92028