Meeting Date: January 28, 2026
Agenda Item No. 9
Distribution Date: January 21, 2026
Batch No. 01

From: C Cotton
To: FGG, Public Comment; Development, Community
Cc: CouncilMember Joe LaCava; Congressman Scott Peters; Government Affairs
Subject: [External] Re: 01/27/2026 and 01/28/2026 County of San Diego Board of Supervisors Agendas
Date: Tuesday, January 20, 2026 5:02:04 PM
Attachments: image.png
image.png
image.png
image.png
image.png

Greetings:

Re: Line Item #9
ADMINISTRATIVE ITEM: SECOND CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION OF ORDINANCE: ADOPT AN ORDINANCE ADDING ARTICLE LXV OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY CODE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ORDINANCES RELATING TO LAW ENFORCEMENT ACCESS TO COUNTY FACILITIES (January 13, 2026- First Reading; January 28, 2026 - Second Reading unless ordinance is modified on second reading)

There is generally a common tension in local governance between fostering inclusive community spaces and ensuring effective, constitutional law enforcement, especially concerning federal immigration activities.

Concerns with the San Diego County ordinance limiting law enforcement access to facilities (**CLEAR Ordinance**) often center on balancing civil liberties with public safety, specifically regarding federal immigration enforcement **(ICE)** access, ensuring sufficient protections for vulnerable populations. Potential conflicts with federal law, and ensuring county facilities aren't used to facilitate discrimination or unlawful detention may hinder legitimate Federal enforcement work while championing it as protecting privacy and preventing profiling.

Jurisdictional clashes may potentially be created between local and federal law enforcement potentially hindering cooperation and access to information crucial for public safety.

Requirements for signage at public facilities and specific clauses in County contracts with third parties service providers create logistical challenges and compliance concerns.

Concerns exist about how to balance law enforcement's need for information with the ordinance's mandate for confidentiality of personal data, especially concerning sensitive characteristics, unless legally required.

Thank You,
Cassandra Cotton

On Tue, Jan 20, 2026 at 4:38 PM C Cotton [redacted]m> wrote:

> Greetings:
>
> Per Line Item # 5:
> **ADOPT A RESOLUTION DELEGATING AUTHORITY TO SUBMIT APPLICATIONS AND EXECUTE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS TO THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT DISASTER RECOVERY AND MITIGATION RESILIENCE INFRASTRUCTURE AND PLANNING PROGRAM FUNDS AND CEQA FINDING**
>
> Concerns regarding the adoption of a resolution to delegate authority for Community Development Block Grant - Disaster Recovery (CDBG-DR) and Mitigation (CDBG-MIT) funds, particularly when combined with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) findings, generally revolve around accountability, financial risk, and environmental oversight.
>
> **Issues that would be commonly raised:**
>
> **1. Delegation of Authority Concerns**
>
> **Reduced Oversight:** Delegating authority to staff, County Administrator and or Director to submit applications and execute contracts limits direct Board of Supervisors oversight on specific project details.
>
> **Liability for Mismanagement:** The Board remains ultimately responsible for compliance, but staff inexperience with complex federal regulations (24 CFR 570) could lead to audit findings or disallowed costs.

Contractual Risks: Improperly executed documents by a designee could lead to delays in receiving funds or breach of agreement with the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).

2. CDBG-DR/MIT Programmatic Concerns

Strict Low-Moderate Income (LMI) Requirement: At least 70% of CDBG-DR funds must benefit low- and moderate-income individuals. If projects fail to meet this threshold, the County may have to repay funds.

Stringent Federal Regulations: Compliance with federal labor laws, fair housing, and procurement rules (Uniform Administrative Requirements) is complex.

Reimbursement Delays: CDBG-DR funds are for reimbursement, and if projects are not managed efficiently, it can strain the local budget while waiting for funds.

3. CEQA Finding Concerns

Premature Approval: A major concern is "piecemealing" or committing to a project before it has undergone proper environmental review, violating CEQA.

Mitigation Monitoring: If the resolution adopts a Mitigated Negative Declaration or EIR findings, the County is responsible for ensuring all mitigation measures are implemented. Improperly delegated authority might cause crucial environmental mitigation to be missed.

Risk of Litigation: Improperly prepared CEQA findings can lead to lawsuits from community groups, delaying projects for months or years.

4. Project-Specific Risks (Districts 1, 2, 4)

Complex Infrastructure: Projects involving disaster resilience (wildfire, flood, earthquake) often have high technical complexity, increasing the risk of budget overruns.

Cost-Share Challenges: CDBG funds are often used for FEMA match requirements, which can complicate compliance as they must adhere to both federal and local rules.

Thank You,
Cassandra Cotton

On Tue, Jan 20, 2026 at 4:12 PM C Cotton <9[redacted]> wrote:

> Greetings again:
>
> Re: Line Item 1:
> **DISTRICT ATTORNEY - AUTHORITY TO CONTINUE TO ADMINISTER THE COMMUNITY GRANT PROGRAM AND DEDICATE CRIMINAL FINES TO SERVICES FOR K-12 YOUTH**
>
> In 2022, the following organizations were awarded Grant funding through this program:

Access Inc
Bayha Group
BIPOC Support Foundation
Border View Family YMCA
Borrego Springs Youth and Seniors Center
Boys & Girls Clubs of Oceanside
Boys to Men Mentoring
Casa de Amistad
Copley-Price Family YMCA
Cabrillo National Monument Foundation
Elementary Institute of Science
Episcopal Community Services
Girls Rising
Groundwork San Diego - Chollas Creek
Hamilton Elementary School
Harmonium
Imagine Creative Services
Interfaith Community Services
Julian Pathways
Kids for Peace
Kupanda & RefugeeNet
La Mesa City Hope
Lambda Archives
Logan Heights Community Development Corp.
MAKE Projects - Mission Edge San Diego
Mid-City Community Music
Momentum
Our Genetic Legacy
Outside the Lens
Promises2Kids
San Diego Youth Services
San Ysidro Health
SAY San Diego
Teens Rise
The Children's Initiative
The David's Harp Foundation
The High Steppers Drill Team
The San Marcos Promise
transcenDANCE Youth Arts Project
Union of Pan Asian Communities
United Way of San Diego
United Women of East Africa Support Team
Vista Community Clinic
Warner Unified School District
You Saved Me Foundation
Youth Assistance Coalition

Do we have statistical reports from this year which outline the successes and constraints experienced by the Awardees? If so, the report would be helpful in determining the request for increased funding.

The County website advertised as follows:

The County of San Diego is seeking to provide community-based businesses and non-profits with grant awards of $50,000 to $250,000 to support, promote and improve opportunities for Kindergarten through 12th Grade (K-12) youth in innovative ways.

Purpose:

The County of San Diego is dedicated to support, promote and improve educational options for San Diego County children in partnership with the communities we serve. The County of San Diego's **K-12 Youth Services Community Grant Program** (K12-CGP) seeks to engage San Diego County community-based organizations to identify and implement new and innovative methods to support educational equity and acceleration of learning, behavioral health needs, housing and food stability, mentorship, and other needs that allow children to thrive.

Grant funding from **$50,000 to $250,000** will be provided to participating organizations for a maximum of twelve (12) months to grow promising community-based solutions that produce positive results in the following **focus areas**:

- **Educational Equity and Acceleration of Learning, examples include but are not limited to:**

  - Enhanced tutoring and after school programming
  - Reducing the digital divide
  - Supporting disconnected youth (youth who should be in school, but are not)
  - Increasing educational access to college for first generation youth

- **Behavioral Health Needs, examples include but are not limited to:**

  - Enhancing on-site services for youth
  - Social and emotional activities for youth, such as yoga, meditation, art, or dance
  - School break support and enrichment
  - Human trafficking mitigation/education/support

- **Housing, Food Stability, and Poverty, examples include but are not limited to:**

  - Laundry services for homeless youth and their families
  - Emergency gift cards and hygiene products

- **Mentorship, examples include but are not limited to:**

  - Summer programming including internships and job opportunities
  - Private sector paid internships
  - Parent or Caregiver liaisons/mentors to help families navigate the school system
  - Mentoring programs or teen drop-in centers

- **Providers and programs that cover more than one of these focus areas/wrap-around services**

These focus areas were determined in collaboration with stakeholders and community partners, based on analysis of youth and family needs for supporting, promoting and improving educational options for K-12 youth. The County of San Diego is looking forward to partnering with small organizations embedded in and representative of the communities who may not have had access to grant opportunities previously but are poised to propose innovative and dynamic approaches to addressing the above K12-CGP areas of focus. The County of San Diego is committed to ensuring K12-CGP providers reflect the diverse makeup of the communities we serve.

Funding Requirements:

Applicants may request **$50,000 to $250,000** to be utilized for up to a twelve (12) month period. Organizations must justify the amount of funds requested and ensure the requested funding is reasonable and plausible for the proposed use of funds. Organizations are encouraged to request funding reasonably needed for the proposed use of funds.

Grant funds awarded are one-time funds intended to provide an opportunity to pilot promising new community-based programs/projects, or to expand existing programs with new and innovative methods to promote and improve educational options for K-12 youth in the specified areas of focus. Grants are also intended to improve educational outcomes and reduce inequities and disparities for historically marginalized communities.

Funds are not intended to supplant or replace existing funding and future funding is based on funding availability and not assured. Although programs showing successful outcomes may be eligible for additional funding, programs that intend to utilize funding as part of a long-term program or project are encouraged to consider a sustainability plan for funding a program beyond the grant period.

Please note that grant agreements will require participating organizations to provide fiscal reporting on use of funds and will also include periodic reporting of program outcomes.

Applicant Eligibility:

- Organizations with a Business License or Non-Profit Organizations
- A minimum of six (6) months operating in San Diego County
- Possess or be in the process of acquiring all licenses, certifications or permits required for performing the proposed service
- Possess or obtain the insurance necessary for services proposed; note that the cost to obtain insurance may be included in the requested grant amount

At the Federal level, there were budget cuts to these programs. Are we justified in recommending an increase in funding?

RECOMMENDATION(S)
DISTRICT ATTORNEY

1. Authorize the District Attorney's Office to continue administering the Community Grant Program and to award up to $5 million annually in grants to organizations providing crime prevention and intervention services that support public safety strategies, with maximum individual grant awards of up to $750,000, based on funding availability.

2. Authorize the District Attorney, or her designee(s), to review and execute all required grants and grant related documents for the Community Grant Program in the current fiscal year and in subsequent fiscal years provided funds are budgeted in future Operational Plans including any extensions, amendments and/or revisions thereof.

3. Authorize the allocation of $25,000,000 to the San Diego County Office of Education (SDCOE) to implement its proposed seven-year countywide K–12 plan funded by fines imposed by the Court related to the Charter School Fraud case. The allocation will be disbursed from the Charter School Fraud trust fund in annual installments over a seven-year term, contingent upon achievement of agreed-upon milestones and performance outcomes.

4. Authorize the District Attorney, or her designee(s), to negotiate and, upon successful negotiations, execute an agreement or agreements with SDCOE to implement its proposed seven-year countywide plan to support K-12 youth.

I admire our District Attorney and had personal conversations with her and her staff over the last few years. We have made great strides with **One Safe Place.** Mrs. Summer has also been a staunch advocate for women fleeing domestic violence and creating a safe space for mothers and children. **I am a survivor of domestic violence.**

Concerns around a District Attorney (DA) running K-12 grants with criminal fines often involve transparency & oversight, potential political bias in funding (favoring allies/avoiding critics), conflicts with dedicated victims' services like One Safe Place, (as seen in federal cases where DAs fought cuts to school mental health), ensuring funds truly help youth vs. DA priorities, and whether criminal fines are being used appropriately rather than for general fund balancing, raising questions about accountability and potential misuse of funds.

One Safe Place (or similar centers) often rely on grants (like federal DOJ funds) for victim services, violence prevention, and supporting at-risk youth, highlighting how shifting funds away from these established needs to other areas (even well-intentioned ones) creates funding gaps.

Concerns & Conflicts

Lack of Independent Oversight: DAs have discretion (prosecutorial discretion), but diverting criminal fines (often meant for victims/restitution) to community grants requires strict oversight to prevent self-dealing or political favoritism. Although, I feel our District Attorney Summer acts with transparency, these are still concerns.

Conflict with Victim Services: Funds generated from criminal cases (fines/fees) traditionally support victims (like those served by One Safe Place in some regions), so diverting them to K-12 programs creates tension over whose needs are prioritized, according to advocacy for victim-focused funding.

Funding Priorities & Bias: Critics worry funds might go to favored non-profits or initiatives aligning with the DA's political agenda, rather than objectively best serving K-12 youth, potentially mirroring federal fights over DEI funding.

Transparency & Accountability: If DAs manage these grants, clear reporting on how funds are spent, who gets them, and measurable outcomes (like improved youth well-being) is crucial but often lacking in grant programs, say advocacy groups.

Grant Stability vs. Political Winds: The sudden cut of federal grants in 2025 showed how shifting political priorities disrupt long-term programs, making stable, non-partisan funding essential for youth services.

Thank You,
Cassandra Cotton

On Tue, Jan 20, 2026 at 3:20 PM C Cotton <9[redacted]m> wrote:

Greetings:

Re: Line Item 1:
SHERIFF – ADOPT AN ORDINANCE ADDING CHAPTER 9 TO TITLE 2, DIVISION 1; AMENDING TITLE 2, DIVISION 1, CHAPTER 1 AND AMENDING TITLE 2, DIVISION 1, CHAPTER 3 OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY CODE OF REGULATORY ORDINANCES RELATING TO LICENSE REQUIRED FROM THE SHERIFF, FORHIRE VEHICLE DRIVERS, AND TAXICABS AND TAXICAB OPERATORS (01/28/2026 – First Reading; 02/10/2026 – Second reading unless ordinance is modified on second reading) (DISTRICTS: ALL):

The conflict over the San Diego County ordinance for Sheriff-issued licenses for hire/taxi drivers likely stems from overlapping jurisdiction and potential preemption by State law (**Public Utilities Code**), which generally regulates transportation, clashing with the County's attempt to regulate via its Code of Regulatory Ordinances (Title 2, Division 1) for local public safety/licensing, creating confusion and legal challenges about who controls for-hire vehicle permits in unincorporated areas.

Here's a breakdown of the likely issues:

State vs. Local Authority: California's Public Utilities Commission (PUC) largely oversees charter-party carriers and taxis; local governments can often only manage business licenses, while the state regulates the actual operating authority and safety. The County's ordinance seems to step into the licensing/permitting realm the state claims jurisdiction over.

Specific Ordinance Language: The ordinance adds Chapter 9 to Title 2, Division 1, requiring licenses from the Sheriff for drivers and operators, which might conflict with existing state permits or other county rules.

Public Safety vs. Economic Regulation: The County likely argues it's for public safety (Sheriff's role), but the State views it as economic regulation of transportation, leading to potential preemption, where state law overrides local law.

Industry Pushback: Taxi and rideshare companies often resist multiple local licensing schemes, preferring a single state standard, which creates tension.

Furthermore, the conflict regarding for-hire driver regulation involves a jurisdictional dispute where state law generally overrides local ordinances if they conflict, particularly in the realm of **Transportation Network Companies (TNCs).**

Key Points of Potential Conflict:

- **State Authority (PUC): The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)** regulates for-hire passenger carriers, including Transportation Network Companies (TNCs like Uber/Lyft) and charter-party carriers (limousines, shuttles).
- Local Authority (Sheriff/County): Taxicab services are generally subject to local regulation by cities and counties.
- **Regulatory Conflict:** A major point of contention is whether TNCs are operating as taxicabs (local control) or charter-party carriers (state control). The CPUC distinguishes them, noting that TNCs are under state authority and prohibited from accepting street hails.
- **Legal Validity:** Local ordinances can be preempted by state law. In California, the CPUC has broad authority over TNCs, which can lead to conflicts where local Sheriff departments attempt to impose stricter or different standards than the state.

Conflict & Resolution:

- **Data Sharing:** A lawsuit against the Marin County Sheriff highlighted this, where local law enforcement was found to be in violation of state laws by sharing driver data with federal/out-of-state agencies.
- **License Confiscation:** Conflicts have arisen regarding whether local sheriff departments can confiscate licenses issued by other entities, leading to agreements limiting this authority to protect due process.
- **Preemption:** In some instances, state-level regulations, such as Proposition 22 in California, have been used to define and often preempt local ridesharing regulations.

On Tue, Jan 20, 2026 at 2:56 PM C Cotton <9[redacted]m> wrote:

Thank you for the updates. I will let you know if I have any questions or concerns.

Cassandra Cotton

On Tue, Jan 20, 2026 at 2:51 PM County of San Diego <sdcounty@service.govdelivery.com> wrote:

San Diego County

County of San Diego Board of Supervisors Meeting Agenda

You are subscribed to receive the County of San Diego Board of Supervisors meeting agendas. Please see the agenda links below for the upcoming Board of Supervisors meeting.

Meeting Date: Tuesday, January 27, 2026 and Wednesday, January 28, 2026

Session Agendas:

- 01282026 General and Land Use Legislative Agenda.pdf
- 01282026 In Home Supportive Services PA Agenda.pdf
- 01282026 Redevelopment Successor Agency Agenda.pdf
- 01272026 Budget Workshop and Community Input Agenda.pdf

Budget Workshop and Community Input: Tuesday, January 27, 2026, at 3 p.m.

- Supporting Documents (Board Letters, attachments)

General and Land Use Legislative Sessions: Wednesday, January 28, 2026, at 9 a.m.

- Supporting Documents (Board Letters, attachments)

In-Home Supportive Services Public Authority: Wednesday, January 28, 2026, at 9 a.m.

- Supporting Documents (Board Letters, attachments)

Redevelopment Successor Agency: Wednesday, January 28, 2026, at 9 a.m.

- Supporting Documents (Board Letters, attachments)

Here's How You Can Be Engaged with Upcoming Agenda Items:

Submit an eComment!
Share your thoughts on upcoming Board meeting agenda items using the eComment service. Submit your eComments once the agenda is released, and they'll be shared with the Board of Supervisors and the Chief Administrative Officer. You can also submit comments during the meeting.

Sign Up to Speak
Now you can sign up to speak anytime, anywhere, from any device. No more having to arrive early or fill out paper forms. Just submit your request before public comment begins on the item, whether you plan to come speak in person or by phone!

Visit https://PublicComment.SanDiegoCounty.gov to submit your request to speak. Step by step instructions are available online.

Watch the Meeting
There are many ways to watch the Board of Supervisors meetings:

- **Watch on Cable TV:** Watch the meeting on these TV channels: Cox Ch. 24 (South) or Ch. 19 (North); Spectrum Ch. 24 or 85; or through the County News Center.
- **Watch Online:** Watch the live stream online. The County broadcasts the meeting through a variety of services.
  - Web Stream with Agenda
  - Vimeo
  - County YouTube Channel
  - Facebook Live
  - X
- **Listen Via Phone:** Listen to the live meeting by dialing (619) 531-4716 while business is being conducted. This is a live, listen-only feed.

Attend the Meeting in Person
The public can attend Board of Supervisors meetings in person and share comments. Overflow rooms are available to watch the meeting and wait to speak. Meetings are held at the County Administration Center, 1600 Pacific Highway, Room 310 (Third Floor), San Diego, CA 92101. Free parking is provided.

For additional information, please visit the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors' Agenda Information page or call (619) 531-5434 or e-mail PublicComment@sdcounty.ca.gov.

Disability Assistance:
Agendas and records are available in alternative formats upon request. For accommodations or questions, contact the Clerk of the Board's office at (619) 531-5434 (voice) or (619) 531-4803 (TTY).

- **Assistive Listening Devices (ALDs):** Available from the Clerk in Room 402 before the meeting and must be returned afterward.
- **Sign Language Interpreters:** Contact the Countywide ADA Title II Coordinator at (619) 531-4908.
- **Wheelchair Accessibility:** An area at the front of the Chamber is reserved for wheelchair users and other accessibility devices.

Please submit accommodation requests at least 72 hours before the meeting when possible.

Interpretation Services:
Spanish interpretation is available for public speakers at Board of Supervisors meetings. Other languages, including Arabic, Mandarin, Korean, Persian, Somali, Tagalog, and Vietnamese, can be provided upon request at least 72 hours before the meeting. Refer to Board Policy A-139 for additional information.

Contact the Clerk of the Board at (619) 531-5434 or email PublicComment@sdcounty.ca.gov for assistance.

Additional meeting information is available online.

Update your subscription preferences on your Subscriber Preferences Page.
You will need to use your email address to log in.

Unsubscribe to all County emails from this service.

If you have questions or problems with the subscription service, please contact Subscriber Help.

This service is provided to you at no charge by the County of San Diego.

This email was sent to 92130connects@gmail.com using GovDelivery Communications Cloud on behalf of: County of San Diego, California · 1600 Pacific Highway · San Diego, CA · 858-694-3900