

This document is a text-only recovery of the original PDF file. Any graphics that were in the original PDF are not included here.  
If you need the original document, please contact the Commission Clerk at the Port of Seattle.

3/14/23, 10:00 AM Mail - Commission-Public-Records - Outlook  
[EXTERNAL] public comment on international tourism marketing initiative

Robin Briggs

Mon 3/13/2023 11:47 PM

To: Commission-Public-Records

WARNING: External email. Links or attachments may be unsafe.

I urge you not to fund this initiative. We do not need to advertise to tourists! We get plenty of them already. We in particular do not need to encourage them to fly, which results in a huge amount of emissions, or take a cruise, which results in lots of emissions \*and\* pollutes our waters.

Lets spend this money on an initiative to do off-shore windmills, which will increase our clean electrical capacity and result in lots of local high wage jobs.

Robin Briggs

Seattle resident

<https://outlook.office365.com/mail/commission-public-records@portseattle.org/inbox/id/AAQkAGE1YmYzYTtk0LWE2N2YtNGZmYi05YjgxLTE5MDVjO...> 1/1

3/15/23, 12:14 PM Mail - Commission-Public-Records - Outlook  
[EXTERNAL] Written Public Comments for 3/14/23 Commission Meeting

James Jennings

Tue 3/14/2023 1:04 PM

To: Commission-Public-Records

WARNING: External email. Links or attachments may be unsafe.

Since I was unable to complete my comments, please include the below as part of the written record.

Good afternoon Executive Director Metruck, President Cho and Commissioners

My name is James Jennings (JJ) and I am here to speak in regard to the Port's HR-34 and EX-29 policies.

For the benefit of Commissioners Hasegawa and Mohamed, who I have not yet had the pleasure to meet, I will provide a bit of my background.

I was a Port employee for more than 26 years, having a bit of a Cinderella story career, starting as a college intern and finishing as the Director of Aviation Business and Properties.

As a sample of my work, I stood before many Commissioners here today, laying the groundwork for many SEA major capital projects, most notably the Concourse C Expansion Project, SEA Gateway Project and Concourse A Expansion for Airport Lounges. I am not sure if it is commonly known, but I am one of the employees that was quietly terminated when the Port instituted its HR-34 policy requiring vaccination, having received no accommodation for my sincerely held religious beliefs.

But I am not here today to tread out sour grapes or ask for my job back, in fact I have worked very hard to move on from my Port employment, currently working with my wife in a small airport consulting business called 2J Consulting. But one challenge we have had is that we are not currently allowed to work on-site at Port facilities, due to our vaccination status, which limits our potential work opportunities to work that can only be completed virtually.

But probably more important, is the fact that not everyone who was terminated has fared as well as I, and you may hear from some of them today during public testimony. Many are bitter and some continue to struggle to find work, so not allowing them this opportunity to return to the Port feels discriminatory in light of the current COVID-19 climate and evidence.

So I am here today to ask the Port why it has not retracted or significantly modified their vaccination requirement policies for both employees (HR-34) and contractors (EX-29)?

Clearly the body of evidence and the practical, political and scientific questions that underpinned the

development of those policies has dissolved?

Practically, we all know unvaccinated employees or contractors create no greater risk to the employee population than a vaccinated employee in the workplace (in fact there are hundreds of unvaccinated tenants and visitors spending significant time in Port facilities every month).

Politically, President Biden has long given up on vaccination requirements for Federal Contractors (which was the impetus for the Port's policy) and both King County and the City of Seattle have both retracted their employee vaccination requirements.

Scientifically, even the CDC now recognizes natural immunity as "at least as beneficial" as a vaccine. Personally, I have had COVID-19 previously, and took a standard antibody test that showed robust antibodies.

So, what ground then does the Port stand on in keeping these outdated policies?

<https://outlook.office365.com/mail/commission-public-records@portseattle.org/inbox/id/AAQkAGE1YmYzYTtk0LWE2N2YtNGZmYi05YjgxLTE5MDVjO...> 1/2

3/15/23, 12:14 PM Mail - Commission-Public-Records - Outlook

Confining them only creates the perception and/or validates the existence of discrimination and/or ulterior motives.

Commissioners, I implore you to retract or significantly modify both (HR-34 and EX-29) to align with the current COVID-19 climate and evidence.

Thanks, you for the opportunity to provide public comment.

James Jennings (JJ)

Managing Partner

2J Consulting LLC

(253) 257-9748

<https://outlook.office365.com/mail/commission-public-records@portseattle.org/inbox/id/AAQkAGE1YmYzYTtk0LWE2N2YtNGZmYi05YjgxLTE5MDVjO...> 2/2