

From: henkinp@earthlink.net
To: [FGG, Public Comment](#)
Subject: [External] Fw: REFORMING THE COUNTY RESERVE POLICY (Please include with documents for Agenda #22)
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 10:46:38 AM

Good Morning,

Just noticed that the item was posted under agenda item 23 per my original request. Should have been item 22. Apologize for the error.

original post:

Good Afternoon, Supervisors,

I think that this is yet another last-minute undeveloped idea that probably would be a good idea if developed properly over time, but you need to reject it.

So, the big picture is that you want to include both assigned and unassigned funds in the reserve funds, that is, funds you allocate for a specific purpose now and the funds needed to maintain the project in coming years, or for operational needs (per item 2 on p. 6 of the Board Letter.)

It's kind of like giving candy to your kid today and tomorrow taking a quarter of it back because it is too sugary, or giving your kid his allowance today and a week later taking back a quarter of it of it for bad behavior.

Actually, it's like the Feds taking back \$40 million of the money they approved for HHSA or them taking back \$6 million of the \$11 million grant for family and mental health services in the LaMesa Schools. So it seems that you are doing what you don't want to happen.

You can expect this to generate huge problems – County Staff having to give back money they need to continue programs in the future – tension. Possible understaffing of vital Fire, Police, or EMT services, which may cause actual safety concerns – possible shortchanging of all the equity projects we recommended against, which may cause further societal disorder (once again pitting Haves vs. Have nots.)

There needs to be guarantees that we have enough funds in the reserves to maintain full emergency services, fire services in this age of huge BESS or EV caused unstoppable wildfires, police problems like being so overwhelmed they can't investigate potential violence, building parts that fly off or break needing repair, roads full of potholes or dangerous to drive on, and on and on.

You also need to define terms like assigned, unassigned, and unlocked funds in the ordinance. The people who reassign funds should have it in front of them for reference, not have to go looking for a definition.

A number of us recently received a survey on what programs to cut. You should have used that as a guide to where excess funds could be taken, and codified that in the ordinance.

I'm glad that you fess up to approving \$635 million in funds you may not need. (1327-692 on p. 7 of the board letter.)

There is a reason that funds are allocated for future maintenance. I agree that five-year funding for some projects is excessive, but the present ordinance simply has too few guarantees that necessary services won't be reduced. This should have been introduced as an idea, not an ordinance.

You need to rethink this, not approve it.

Regards,

Paul Henkin