

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Desmond, Jim](#); [MontgomerySteppe, Monica](#); [Anderson, Joel](#); [Lawson-Remer, Terra](#)
Cc: [FGG, Public Comment](#); [Robert Johnson Live Data](#); [San Diego UT Senior Editor](#); [San Diego UT Community Op Ed](#); [Times of San Diego](#); [Voice of San Diego](#)
Subject: [External] AMENDING THE BUDGET (please include with documents for agenda #6)
Date: Thursday, June 19, 2025 8:09:34 AM

Good Morning, Supervisors,

So, this change adds \$18.3 million to the budget now and gets 0.3 million back in 2 years. At first glance, it sounds good that most of this is for Public Safety, but there is an item for LGTBQ+ housing, of which I disapprove.

But there are two major drawbacks. First: this does not address the \$200 million- deficit in the reserves. When the State and Feds are threatening to withhold or claw back grants beyond just not approving them, this is a pretty bad move.

Second: the revised budget says “The Revised Recommended Budget does not take into account impacts related to the California Governor's May Revise and the federal budget. To help address potential impacts of policy and budget changes at the federal and State levels, the County implemented an Incident Command Structure that is closely monitoring changes and direct impacts to County programs, and County staff are evaluating mitigation strategies. Once impacts are known, it will be addressed as appropriate, including but not limited to stand alone action or in future quarterly status letters.

Suppose funds are planned but at the last moment are not actually allocated. This sounds like we would have to wait while the wheels of bureaucracy move slowly (or maybe even for a quarterly status letter) and more people would have to suffer the negative effects while they wait since there are inadequate reserves. And the situation would be far worse if funds were actually clawed back. The army would say ‘piss poor planning.’

We need to recognize a fiscal crisis for what it is.

Regards,

Paul Henkin