

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Desmond, Jim](#); [Supervisor Joel Anderson District 2](#); [MontgomerySteppe, Monica](#); [BOS, District1Community](#); [Lawson-Remer, Terra](#)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** [External] NEW TEFRA PROCESS FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO (please include with documents for agenda #10)  
**Date:** Thursday, August 21, 2025 3:27:07 PM

---

Good Afternoon, Supervisors,

Having the Tefra Hearing CONDUCTED by the JPA and/or issuer of the TEFRA bonds is an open invitation to conflict of interest. The hearing needs to be conducted by neutral parties and it is clear to me that both the JPA and issuer of the bonds have a huge interest in seeing that their recommendations or plots are followed.

Another problem many of us have noted is that the JPA or bond issuers do not care diddly squat for the private interests they are affecting or for the public in general.

This is also an item potentially of huge importance to the public and should not have been put on the Consent calendar, but rather the property, conflict of interest, and potential legal and liability issues should be open to a full public discussion.

Allowing phone-ins to JPA meetings is the only positive note I can see, but I am not sure how effective this would be since it would preclude fancy exhibits in opposition to those of the JPA or issuers.

Moreover, the JPA's seem to be dominated by industry and lobbyists. Moreover, if you were to do this, there should be a robust discussion of the individual appointments rather than lumping these all into a consent item which generally allows only a few seconds for discussion of a

nominee's merits.

Regards,

Paul Henkin