

Meeting Date: October 22, 2024
Agenda Item No. 32
Distribution Date: October 21, 2024
Batch No. 01

From: henkinp@earthlink.net
To: [Lawson-Remer, Terra](#); [Vargas, Nora \(BOS\)](#); [MontgomerySteppe, Monica](#); [Desmond, Jim](#); [Anderson, Joel](#)
Cc: [FGG, Public Comment](#); [CV Live Data Robert Johnson](#); [ABC 10 San Diego](#); [Fox 5 69 San Diego](#); [News Fox Cable Insider](#); [KOGO Carl DeMaio \(Reform California KOGO DeMaio Report\)](#); [KPBS San Diego](#); [KUSI 51 San Diego](#); [La Prensa San Diego](#); [NBC 7 San Diego](#); [San Diego UT Senior Editor](#); [San Diego UT Community Op Ed](#); saopinion@timesofsandiego.com
Subject: [External] RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION 35 (PLEASE INCLUDE WITH DOCUMENTS FOR AGENDA #32)
Date: Friday, October 18, 2024 4:49:35 PM

Hi Supervisors,

Re-ADOPT RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION 35 AND WAIVE BOARD POLICY A-72

What a waste. Half the voters have probably voted already. Most have probably made up their minds by now. And a lot more will have voted by the time anyone reads the letter you propose. And if they are really eager to have you make up their minds for them, it's in the supporting docs.

So, the big picture – the State is already taxing the organizations which provide Medicare services to fund Medicare presumably to make up for more of the deficit it created, but the catch is that it is permanent and it seems that a substantial chunk of the money does not actually go to MediCal. So basically the people who provide services to low income people would have less to spend on them.

And then section 14199.106 (2)(b)(1)(A) says that after 2027, the fundholder has to use all the money in the fund annually, which means that the money needs to be spent somewhere even if there is no medical need, so the patient might have less the next year.

And section 14199.108 as I read it sets limits for money available for various types of medical care, which I do not think is good practice. If someone needs care, it should not depend on money being available in

a specific account.

It is a good idea in principle, but devil's in the details, so I do not approve of prop 35 as written. I do not think you should be supporting it.

Regards,

Paul Henkin