

Board of Supervisors

Meeting Time: 03-24-26 09:00



eComments Report

Meetings	Meeting Time	Agenda Items	Comments	Support	Oppose	Neutral
Board of Supervisors	03-24-26 09:00	43	2	0	1	1

Sentiments for All Meetings

The following graphs display sentiments for comments that have location data. Only locations of users who have commented will be shown.

Overall Sentiment



Board of Supervisors

03-24-26 09:00


Agenda Name	Comments	Support	Oppose	Neutral
14. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEM: SECOND CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION OF AN ORDINANCE: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE COMPENSATION ORDINANCE AND ESTABLISHING COMPENSATION RELATED TO THE RATIFIED TENTATIVE AGREEMENT FOR THE EMPLOYEE BARGAINING UNIT - SO REPRESENTED BY SAN DIEGO COUNTY SUPERVISING PROBATION OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION (3/3/2026- First Reading; 3/24/2026- Second Reading, unless the ordinance is modified on second reading)	2	0	1	1

Sentiments for All Agenda Items

The following graphs display sentiments for comments that have location data. Only locations of users who have commented will be shown.


Overall Sentiment

Support (0%) Oppose (50%) Neutral (50%)
No Response (0%)



Agenda Item: eComments for 14. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEM:
SECOND CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION OF AN ORDINANCE:
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE COMPENSATION ORDINANCE AND ESTABLISHING COMPENSATION RELATED TO THE
RATIFIED TENTATIVE AGREEMENT FOR THE EMPLOYEE BARGAINING UNIT - SO REPRESENTED BY SAN DIEGO COUNTY
SUPERVISING PROBATION OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION (3/3/2026- First Reading; 3/24/2026- Second Reading, unless the
ordinance is modified on second reading)

Overall Sentiment



Bella F

Location:
Submitted At: 11:32am 03-23-26

Does "negotiated" = Merit?

Paul Henkin

Location: 91902, Bonita
Submitted At: 11:59am 03-18-26

This also sounds excessive.

Section 2.1.17 says that employees in bargaining units DS, SM, and SO will get lump sum payments. Units DM and DS are already getting payments in the previous agenda item. So they need to be removed from this one. Nothing like a bit of proofreading.

The Employees are already getting a raises. Why should they get an additional raise for market conditions, particularly in these financially uncertain times.

Section 1.7.32 is a bit excessive when is offers 5% extra just for being armed. And then to continue this after June 2028 just for the Supervising Probation Officer is discriminatory.

Section 1.8.4 offers an extra 2.5% increasing to 5% for working in a 24-hour institution again just for the Supervising Probation Officer again discriminatory.

This is not good.