

From: henkinp@earthlink.net
To: [paul](#)
Cc: [FGG, Public Comment](#)
Subject: [External] REDUCING GUN VIOLENCE AGAIN (Please include with docs. for agenda #14)
Date: Thursday, October 3, 2024 8:36:17 AM

Good Morning, Supervisors,

First thing I notice is that the Board letter-Letter mentions shootings in Georgia and Northern California, and that San Diego County has taken aggressive action to close loopholes in gun laws, removing at least three times more illegal firearms from our streets. I'm sure it is a big number, but three times more than WHAT?

The letter also says research from Brady: United Against Gun Violence found that at least 90 California law enforcement agencies, including San Diego County, have purchased firearms from dealers with documented violations against gun regulations. Doesn't say what the violations were (like was it a signature missing or an actual sale to a felon) or where the actual dealers were, even. Maybe our more miscreant officers are buying guns in another County?

Then, the information the ordinance would require is duplicative and would affect the running and profitability of the business.

- a) proof of compliance is excessive. The vendor already would be submitting copies of inspection reports which would show essentially the same thing.
- e) Disclosure of violations from inspections is excessive for the same reason.
- f) 5) Assisting law enforcement agencies in the investigation and prevention should be something the law enforcement monitors and the individual gun shops should not have to record this separately.

This proposed ordinance is based on data not directly applicable to this County and would be a burden to business more than a help to us. I urge you to reject and modify this. Also, please consider whether it is still needed.

Regards,

Paul Henkin

From: henkinp@earthlink.net
To: [Desmond, Jim](#); [Anderson, Joel](#); [MontgomerySteppe, Monica](#); [Vargas, Nora \(BOS\)](#); [Lawson-Remer, Terra](#)
Cc: [FGG, Public Comment](#)
Subject: [External] BOARD SUPPORT FOR PROP 4-SAFE DRINKING WATER, etc. (Please include with docs. for agenda #14)
Date: Thursday, October 3, 2024 8:57:35 AM

Good Morning, Supervisors,

Safe Drinking Water – The water has a high level of toxic chemicals, like flourine or chlorine. Do we need more chemicals? More side-effects?

Wildfires – The huge Bridge Fire, Line Fire, and Airport Fire – huge fires – took days to put out. In fact, one of them even re-ignited. And the huge Park Fire we know was caused by someone rolling an EV down a steep slope into a river. Maybe we should do something about EV's instead of less dangerous vehicles.

Droughts - We have had serial droughts forever. Are we not prepared?

Clean Air? You haven't been able to clean up TJ River Valley Air or Pottery Kiln Air for how many years? I suspect that the solution is to make the polluters responsible, not the taxpayers funding more and more bonds. What is the good of a bond if the polluters can just buy a vote or a judge to get out of remediating the crap they put into the air? Sort of like Craig Netwig and the horses. He's apparently so important to government he can get away with murder.

And then a paltry 850 mil for clean energy and \$300 mil for agriculture?

One of the few good things in here is \$50 mil for the TJ River Valley mess.

And I'm not sure why you want to waste your time on this. With all of the interest groups the bill covers, it's sure to pass anyway.

Regards,

Paul Henkin