

Meeting Date: October 23, 2024
Agenda Item No. 02
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; [Voice of San Diego](#)
Subject: [External] AGREEMENT WITH SDRPIC FOR CLIMATE-RESILIENT STORMWATER PROJECTS (PLEASE INCLUDE WITH DOCUMENTS FOR LAND USE AGENDA #2)
Date: Thursday, October 17, 2024 6:51:50 PM

Hi Supervisors,

Re-AMEND GRANT AGREEMENT WITH THE SAN DIEGO REGIONAL POLICY & INNOVATION CENTER TO ALLOCATE \$2 MILLION IN AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT FUNDS TO CLIMATE-RESILIENT GREEN STORMWATER INFRASTRUCTURE DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS AND NO CEQA RELATED EXEMPTION

ARPA Money for non-COVID related issues? Not sure if that is even legal,

As you may know, I'm all about big picture thinking, particularly for government. The big picture is that you are apparently taking 9.5 acres of land from DPW, which would be in the public domain, and giving it to a private nonprofit foundation, the San Diego Regional Policy & Innovation Center (SDRPIC.)

Under the tax law, a section 501(c)(3) organization is presumed to be a private foundation unless it requests, and qualifies for, a ruling or determination as a public charity.

I looked it up. The website says 'The San Diego Regional Policy & Innovation Center (PIC) is a partnership between The San Diego Foundation, the County of San Diego, and the world's leading think tank – The Brookings Institution – to conduct research and policy

analysis and help solve the region's biggest problems.'

So you'd think that we would be farther along with all our crises – TJ River, homeless, immigrants, floods, BESS fires, and so on. In fact, looking at the one annual report it displays, I didn't see any real accomplishments.

And the 9.5 acres would come from a homeless shelter – so take your pic – homeless or this experiment. And the site seems to be a recreation area, including a ballfield, so I wonder what will be left.

Then, while this is billed as some sort of innovative thing, the listed projects - installation of gutters, rain barrels, rain gardens, biofiltration features, permeable pavement, a subsurface cistern that can capture stormwater and be used for irrigation on site, and drainage infrastructure – do not seem to be innovative.

Lastly, the Board letter says 'Today's action does not constitute approval of a specific project or set of projects, nor guarantee which projects will be constructed.' so we don't have any assurance that the money will be spent on what we were told.

This is a risky and possibly illegal (perhaps even corrupt) idea. I urge you to reject it and reconsideration if you and we know what we're getting for our money.

Regards,

Paul Henkin