

**From:** [henkinp@earthlink.net](mailto:henkinp@earthlink.net)  
**To:** [Desmond, Jim](#); [Anderson, Joel](#); [MontgomerySteppe, Monica](#); [Lawson-Remer, Terra](#)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** [External] COST RECOVERY PROPOSALS (Please include with documents for Land Use agenda #6, 7, and 8)  
**Date:** Thursday, May 1, 2025 1:59:42 PM

---

Good Afternoon, Supervisors,

There are 3 cost recovery proposals on the Land Use agenda which looks like a soak-the-poor scheme. I think you need to reject this and find other ways to reduce the County's deficit.

## 6. COST RECOVERY PROPOSAL TO ADOPT ORDINANCES RELATED TO FEES

AND DEPOSITS TO LAND DEVELOPMENT EFFECTIVE FISCAL  
YEAR

2025-2026

So, you propose to increase fees, presumably so you can continue your wasteful spending habits. Excessive contingency fees. Equity giveaways.

You want to raise fees by an average of 4.5% to 10% (very inflationary) and eliminate the Homeowner Relief Act program, which provides loans or grants to eligible homeowners for minor home health and safety repairs.

And then, you have the nerve to say These increases in PDS and DPW may not fully address cost increases based on future negotiated labor agreements, which is basically guaranteeing future financial mayhem for us because you cannot negotiate in the interest of all the people of this County.

In other words, more shoddy and dangerous homes (increasing wildfire danger to all) and financial pressure.

And then you threaten to withhold services you're already planning to cut. Get a grip. I suggest that the first thing is to share the pain and cut your salaries a bit. And maybe reduce the number of managers at the County a bit.

And I'd like an independent audit first to verify that all the County's BS programs are not wasteful. Put your money where your mouths are.

#### 7. COST RECOVERY PROPOSAL TO ADOPT ORDINANCES RELATED TO FEES

AND DEPOSITS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL  
HEALTH AND

QUALITY EFFECTIVE FISCAL YEAR 2025-26

Same script, but an average 5% increase. A bit less onerous, still inflationary. And this time, it looks like you're targeting food and housing for non-profits – which means low-income people will be squeezed once more. Just how stupid do you think we are?

#### 8. COST RECOVERY PROPOSAL TO ADOPT ORDINANCES RELATED TO FEES

IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, WEIGHTS AND  
MEASURES

EFFECTIVE FISCAL YEAR 2025-26

This seems to be the best, with fees raised only between 2.5% and 7.2% (still inflationary though.)

But here's one way to save. Stop the water purification program. If you stop putting so much crap into the water, like fluoride, pesticides, insecticides, and all, we can go back to the days of clean water. I mean, a bit of poo and pee from animals and all strengthens immunity and didn't really taste bad, like it does even after all your testing.

And maybe we can cut down on industrial hemp which, as I understand it, uses huge amounts of water to grow.

So you really need to do more innovative stuff before you raise fees.

Regards,

Paul Henkin