

**Meeting Date: September 9, 2025**

**Agenda Item No. 23**

**Distribution Date: September 5, 2025**

**Batch No. 01**

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Desmond, Jim](#); [Supervisor Joel Anderson District 2](#); [MontgomerySteppe, Monica](#); [BOS, District1Community](#); [Lawson-Remer, Terra](#)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** [External] REFORMING THE COUNTY RESERVE POLICY (Please include with documents for agenda #23)  
**Date:** Thursday, September 4, 2025 6:04:09 PM

---

Good Morning, Supervisors,

Thank you for including this second consideration in the discussion Section. It is important to include everyone's reactions, even after the first reading.

This is the same flawed proposal presented in May. In fact it seems to have the same numbers as in May which may now be off by enough to skew the amount you need. Blank check city. Basically, it sets the stage for "defunding" the police, fire, or real emergencies. If you really want this sort of system, look at the cities who listened to the GFOA – most of which have problems with basic services like police and fire.

A better alternative to reassigning funds from vital public safety accounts is to reassign amounts from multiple sources, as the Sheriff's office seems to have had no problem with in Consent item 4 on 8/26. They just used 3 pots of money instead of 1.

The present proposal would be like the Feds taking back \$40 million of the money they approved for HHSA or \$6 million of the \$11 million grant for family and health services in the LaMesa Schools. So it seems that you are doing what you don't want to happen.

You can expect huge problems – County Staff having to give back money they need to continue programs in the future – tension. Possible understaffing of vital Fire, Police, or EMT services, possible shortchanging of all the equity projects we recommended against, which may cause further societal disorder (once again pitting Haves vs. Have nots.)

There need to be guarantees that we have enough funds in the reserves to maintain

full emergency services, fire services in this age of huge BESS or EV caused unstoppable wildfires, police problems like being so overwhelmed they can't investigate potential violence, building parts that fly off or break needing repair, roads full of potholes or dangerous to drive on, and on and on.

You also need to define terms like assigned, unassigned, and unlocked funds in the ordinance. The people who reassign funds should have it in front of them for reference, not have to go looking for a definition.

In May, a number of us recently received a survey on what programs to cut. You should have used that as a guide to where excess funds could be taken, and codified that in the ordinance.

I'm glad that you fess up to approving \$635 million in funds you may not need. (\$1327-\$692 on p. 7 of the board letter = \$635.)

There is a reason that funds are allocated for future maintenance. I agree that five-year funding for some projects is excessive, but the present ordinance simply has too few guarantees that necessary services won't be reduced. This should have been introduced as an idea, not an ordinance.

You need to reject this scheme, not approve it, and at least base it on current numbers.