

Meeting Date: May 19, 2026
Agenda Item No. 24
Distribution Date: May 18, 2026
Batch No. 04

From: [Balaji, Vaidehi](#)
To: [FGG, Public Comment](#)
Subject: item 25
Date: Monday, May 18, 2026 9:00:31 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

I am opposing item 24 and supporting item 25 in the 05/19/26 board of supervisors meeting agenda.

Thank you,



Vaidehi Balaji
Appraiser III
Operations
Office of Jordan Z. Marks
Assessor/Recorder/County Clerk

From: [Charlotte Mitchell](#)
To: [FGG, Public Comment](#)
Subject: [External] Revised Charter Reform Proposal; ITEMS 24 and 25
Date: Saturday, May 16, 2026 10:45:51 PM

It has come to my attention that the Board of Supervisors advanced a sweeping Charter overhaul last month.

;

Specifically ITEM 24 raises serious concerns about transparency, accountability and taxpayer protections.

However, I am in favor of ITEM 25 because it:

1. Protects against self-serving term limits;
2. Keeps county government professional, not political;
3. Creates truly independent oversight;
4. Protects taxpayer dollars and contracting integrity;
5. Removes legally questionable and confusing provisions.

Please nix ITEM 24. I support ITEM 25.

Charlotte Mitchell
San Diego resident for 50 years

From: [Potter, Andrew](#)
To: [FGG, Public Comment](#)
Subject: FW: [External] Fw: Charter Reform
Date: Monday, May 18, 2026 8:57:05 AM

From: Shanley, Roarke E <Roarke.Shanley@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2026 8:51 AM
To: Potter, Andrew <Andrew.Potter@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Cc: Sharp, Ryan <Ryan.Sharp@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Kulis, Michael <Michael.Kulis@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Young, Dallin <Dallin.Young@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Subject: Fw: [External] Fw: Charter Reform

Good morning Andrew,

Supervisor Anderson received the below correspondence from Jack McGrory regarding items number 24 and 25 on this Tuesday's agenda.

He would like to ensure that this letter is reflected in the record.

Thank you, and please let me know if you have any questions!

Roarke Shanley

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Jack McGrory <[REDACTED]>
To: Joel Anderson
Sent: Sunday, May 17, 2026 at 09:29:08 AM PDT
Subject: Charter Reform

>>> As you know, I support most of the county charter reforms that have been proposed.

>>>

>>> However, there are two areas that I would propose changes to the recommendations.

>>>

>>> The first are the changes related to purchasing. I would not change the existing language in the county charter regarding board contact with county staff during the purchasing process. The existing charter language was put in place after a series of scandals relating to the award of contracts. The purpose of the changes was to protect the process from undue political influence. The language clearly prevents members of the board or their staffs from contacting county purchasing staff during the selection and award of vendor and construction contracts. My understanding is that the total value of these contracts comes to approximately \$2.3 billion.

>>>

>>> Any contact with county staff by members of the board or their staff could be viewed as direct or indirect influence during the award of those contracts. I believe that it is appropriate for the board or their staff to contact and ask questions of county staff after the contracts are awarded pending approval by the board. I think it's improper for those contacts to occur during the award of the

contracts. Such contacts could be viewed as exercising undue influence in this process, which could lead to corruption and scandals.

>>>

>>> Therefore, I would adhere to the old adage "if it ain't broke, don't fix it."

>>>

>>> The second area I have concerns about are the confirmation and potential removal by the board of deputy CAO's and department heads.

>>>

>>> For key politically sensitive positions, such as county health officer, emergency services director, and public defender I believe that the recommended changes to have the CAO select these positions subject to board approval is appropriate.

>>>

>>> However, to have the board involved in the selection and removal of department heads and deputy CAO's can lead to undo political influence in the appointment of professional managers. I believe that in the interest of efficient county government that this is not appropriate. The CAO is selected by the board and should be held responsible for the selection and termination of deputy CAO's and department heads. These appointments should be made by the CAO without influence by the board. If the board does not like the quality of these appointments, the board needs to hold the CAO accountable and responsible. But to have the board involved in the appointment and termination of this broad range of positions is inappropriate.

>>>

>>> The county is a well run professional organization under management supervision of the CAO. The system has worked well and should not be changed.

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>> Sent from my iPhone

>>>

>>>> On May 15, 2026, at 3:30 PM, Jack McGrory [REDACTED] > wrote:

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> Sent from my iPhone

From: [Judy Gagnon](#)
To: [FGG, Public Comment](#)
Subject: [External] Meeting code 11345
Date: Sunday, May 17, 2026 12:25:15 PM

I oppose item 24 and am in favor of item 25
Phil and Judy Gagnon
[REDACTED] San Diego, CA 92131
Sent from my iPad