

Meeting Date: May 19, 2026
Agenda Item No. 24
Distribution Date: May 13, 2026
Batch No. 01

From: [Berle Dale](#)
To: [FGG, Public Comment](#)
Subject: [External] Term Limits
Date: Wednesday, May 13, 2026 9:54:05 AM

NO to extending term limits! They were set in 2010 by popular vote and should remain so.
Stop this power grab!

B. Dale
Lakeside

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Desmond, Jim](#); [Supervisor Joel Anderson District 2](#); [MontgomerySteppe, Monica](#); [BOS, District1Community](#); [Lawson-Remer, Terra](#)
Cc: [FGG, Public Comment](#)
Subject: [External] MODERNIZING THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY CHARTER (Please include with documents for agenda #24)
Date: Wednesday, May 13, 2026 10:51:05 AM

Good Morning, Supervisors,

Although the amendments make this a bit better and somewhat more palatable, some of this is still self-serving and tends to promote partisan politics while not doing that much for transparency or independent oversight in County government. This Charter Amendment needs to be rejected.

Sec. 401.5 – Don't see why term limits were put later. It is better here, up front.

Sec. 500.3 – Thank you for replacing the wording 'infamous crime.' with better language.

Sec. 500.4 – Suggest you add 'Treasurer/Tax Collector to the list of County officers to confirm and review..

Sec. 501 – Good addition to Appointed Officers to have a budget analyst and a program auditor. But these are political appointees and in no way independent.

Sec. 501.9 (b) allowing the requesting and receiving of assistance in preparing Supervisor-led initiatives sounds like you are authorizing staff to do quasi-political work for you instead of preparing your own initiatives. Many of these seem to be last minute political quick fixes, especially the letters recommending legislative action on behalf of the County but unsupported by poll data to confirm that the County agrees.

Sec. 600 – No reason to expand term limits for Elected Officials, and lengthening your own term in the middle of it is a conflict of interest. I favor a limit to two consecutive terms and, after a few years 'breathing space you can be re-elected, once we've had

the experience of a different person. This would allow supervisors to run for three four-year terms, instead of the current limit of two four-year terms. However, it also would impose term limits on the sheriff, district attorney and other county elected officials who currently have none, which would not happen as planned since it is against State law. (a good move to add these, but if they have the same term limits, it basically guarantees officers with similar political beliefs)

Sec. 700 – A list which you want to remove of appointive officers is useful and restrains the Board from overburdening us with expensive political or ad hoc appointees.

Sec. 711 to 711.6 – No to another political County Commission. If you do this, the public will go elsewhere to complain about your ethics or lack thereof. Might be worth the money if it were elective.

Sec. 914 – Thank you for adding in Regulation of politicking that ‘This section shall not prohibit elected officials or their staff from engaging in political activities not otherwise prohibited by State or federal law outside of working hours.’

Sec. 915 - Prohibiting relatives ‘up to the fourth degree of consanguinity’ from working in the County probably excludes half of the County from working for it.

Regards,

Paul Henkin

From: [Michael McElroy](#)
To: [FGG, Public Comment](#)
Subject: [External] View this page!
Date: Wednesday, May 13, 2026 10:13:11 AM

Please vote NO on the measure to expand the county supervisors term limits. We already settled this in 2010 and I don't appreciate being asked to settle it again.

Michael McElroy
Oceanside, CA

From: [Mary Davis](#)
To: [San Diego Council](#)
Subject: (Internal) Item 24: Charter Amendment: NO to Power Grab & Laundering
Date: Wednesday, May 13, 2026 11:02:14 AM

What makes the wheels of the San Diego County bus go around? Special interests, and the incestuous, circular cycle of performative allegiance which is then later rewarded with raises, handouts, and behind-the-scenes access to power.

Below is a picture from the original Board of Supervisors first reading on "Charter Reform" on April 21, 2026.



[Photo courtesy NBC 7/39 San Diego]

Take a close look at this room. This isn't organic public participation; *this is the hue-crew of San Diego's special-interest circular economy*. Every matching shirt you see—unions, NGOs, climate groups, political clubs—is here to cheer on charter 'reforms' that would extend the supervisors' own terms and let them politicize key positions.

The special interests donate, turn out bodies in branded colors, and provide ready-made talking points — then in return, they're first in line for county contracts, MOUs, and insider access.

This is how power launders itself: not in back rooms, but in full color, right in front of the cameras, while the ordinary public gets squeezed to the back of the room and off the agenda.



From: [Mary Davis](#)
To: [FGG, Public Comment](#)
Subject: [External] Item 24 - Charter Amendments: NO QUEENS IN SAN DIEGO
Date: Wednesday, May 13, 2026 11:06:37 AM

NO to politically-motivated 'Charter reform' that would allow existing Supervisors to stay in power a third term.



Terra Lawson-Remer speaks often about protecting democracy, yet these proposed Charter changes seem curiously tailored to consolidate more power around the very office she holds. Extending political influence, reshaping governance rules, and expanding institutional control under the banner of “reform” is not public service if the primary beneficiary is the politician proposing it.

When elected officials start redesigning the system in ways that strengthen their own grip on it, it's not 'democracy'; it's political self-dealing masquerading as principle.

NO to this Charter Amendment, and ...

NO QUEENS IN SAN DIEGO!

Respectfully,

Mary Davis (aka Oliver Twist)