

**Meeting Date: March 11, 2025**  
**Agenda Item No. 08**  
**Distribution Date: March 6, 2025**  
**Batch No. 01**

**From:** [henkinp@earthlink.net](mailto:henkinp@earthlink.net)  
**To:** [Desmond, Jim](#); [Anderson, Joel](#); [MontgomerySteppe, Monica](#)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** [External] FY 2025-29 HOUSING COSOLIDATED PLAN (PLEASE INCLUDE WITH DOCS FOR AGENDA #8)  
**Date:** Thursday, March 6, 2025 10:25:55 AM

---

Hi Supervisors,

First thing I notice looking at the data is that the NA-10.1 and 2 tables are 2022 data – not even an estimate for 2025. And Na-10.3 to 8 are 2020 data. I smell a rat. Maybe even see a few. If I were voting, I would vote to reject and rewrite right here.

One of the questions (p. 24) is to Estimate the number and type of families in need of housing assistance who are disabled or victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking. The report doesn't even do that, although the data is a bit newer, from 2023.

The report (p. 35) even says that the RTFH (Regional Task Force on the Homeless) meets monthly to identify gaps in homeless services, establish funding priorities, and to pursue an overall systematic approach to address homelessness. So why cannot they provide more current data than FY 2023 (although it claims it's from 2024.)

And even the AMI income limits are 2024 data, although it is 2025 and the new limits are published.

More manipulation: the question (p. 39) is to Identify any Agency Types not consulted and provide rationale for not consulting. The answer is that No organization was purposefully excluded from the community engagement process. This is not the question, The question was who was, in fact, excluded, purposefully or not.

Community input – I notice that many of the sessions were during normal working hours, so I would call them ½ or even ¼ community sessions. Also none in the coastal zone from Del Mar to Oceanside, or in Chula Vista/National City.

And it is really hard to believe (p. 40) that out of 14,027 Community input announcement emails sent, no comments were received. So it looks like we have about 250 community member comments representing the entire County.

And then on p. 58, the table lists about half of the County's cities and towns in its racial breakdown – so much for equity.

The one outstanding factoid I see is that American Indian, Alaska Natives have the least household problems (Table NA-15.01 to 4, p. 50) and hope they get an award for that.

So the report is a sham as well as based on years-old data. Please reject and have the authors update all the old and misleading data (or come up with current estimates) and sketchy narrative.

Regards,

Paul Henkin