

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

From: Ronnieslager

Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 9:01 AM

To: #CI-StPaul\_Ward7

Subject: Sick-leave vote on Aug. 24

Dear Ms. Prince:

As the wife of a small businessman, I'm asking you to vote no on August 24th to the sick-leave mandate. I'm hoping council members are not so out of touch that they vote this through. This sounds like a perfect way to ensure no business ever locates in St. Paul. We will find ourselves in the same position locally as we are nationally -- everything is made in another country because the cost of doing business is so prohibitive. Do you want businesses to stay or locate in St. Paul? A yes vote on this issue clearly seems like the answer to this would be no. Would it be nice to provide everybody with everything they want? Yes. Is it possible to do this? No. Council members seem to think they have this unending stream of money coming from the businesses and taxpayers. Where is your budget control? Use your voice and vote NO. Keep businesses in St. Paul. Keep taxes down not on a continuous rise.

A disgusted St. Paul resident tired of being taxed and feed to death.

Veronica Slager

19xx North Park Drive

St. Paul, MN 55119

**From:** Edward Stuart

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 17, 2016 9:21 AM

**To:** #CI-StPaul\_Ward3

**Subject:** Oppose These ESST Amendments

Dear Mr. Tolbert,

Thanks again for your leadership and efforts to implement an Earned Sick and Safe Time ordinance in St. Paul. As the ordinance stands now, it would be one of the strongest such ordinances in the country and a model for cities and states (including MN) across the country. I am writing to you ask you to oppose any amendments that weaken the ordinance.

I have been out of state for a week and am not quite up-to-speed regarding proposed amendments and their status. Below are three amendments that I oppose.

The latest amendment in consideration would exclude a class of workers. This is just wrong. All workers, even those that "can afford it", need time off when sick that is paid time off. Without it, I believe the health objectives that make our ordinance a model will be lost; sick workers will come to work because they won't get paid if they don't. Exempting classes of people sets the wrong precedence.

Another amendment I heard was to change the amount of hours that can be accrued, both annually and carried over. Reducing the hours really severely compromises the value of paid sick time. Please retain the current accrual language.

I wrote to you previously, concerned that the private right of action be kept in the ordinance. I still believe PRA is essential to enforcement and does not impose any negative consequences. HREEO, who the council authorized to lead

the writing of the ordinance, included PRA so that workers would have the most independent avenue possible to address employer violations. I that HREEO can perform this function, but I question whether this new responsibility will overwhelm their workload. I am also aware that other cities are considering adding PRA to their enacted ordinances because it has been proven to be necessary. Finally, the fear of lawyers trolling for individuals is silly since it will be groups of workers by one employer that will need PRA.

Please continue your leadership on ESST by opposing these amendments.

Thanks,

Ed Stuart

Ward 3 Resident