

---

**From:** Brandi Nuse-Villegas <brandiangela78@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 26, 2021 12:11 PM  
**To:** BOSComments  
**Subject:** April 27 Public Presentation/ public comment

CAUTION!!! - EXTERNAL EMAIL - THINK BEFORE YOU CLICK

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I was very disappointed with how board members handled various issues during the last meeting.

When people come to you, they should be heard with respect, especially if they are your hired experts that are doing the work that you are not trained to do.

Bradau, Pomaville and Vohra are our county's experts on health and on this pandemic, not the board. I understand that you need to look at decisions such as the lifting of the emergency order from many angles, but I do feel that the response to these experts was partisan rather than objective. Their statements should have been read aloud, made available to the public, and considered by the board. The one example you shared was not "sentimental." Sharing concerns about public response is not sentimental. They are charged with public safety and the board seems to be blowing them off based on your views and preferences and contempt for other decision makers. Pacheco said that Vohra's views slanted because Vohra has seen the suffering in the hospitals. I ask each councilmember to consider how much time they spent really listening to those who have been dealing with COVID-19 and the families who unexpectedly lost loved ones. It may not have changed the vote, but even respecting their views and speaking to the public to care for one another by following the state mandates is responsible and caring leadership.

As well, it was very unprofessional for Magsig to respond to the public as he did regarding the redistricting item. One person expressed that the board shouldn't make decisions because you may act in a way that benefits you. While each of you may choose to not act in such a way, it is reasonable to bring this up as a possible conflict of interest. Magsig's response was to ask the speakers if they brought their opponents to this meeting for the sake of everyone having a voice. This is an unacceptable and ridiculous statement as well because the speakers were asking to be represented in their community, which would include those with different views. What is your opposition to that? What does it say about you that you oppose those with different views? Or do you just feel the need to denigrate people and take this personally because they have different political views than you. In fact, people in the audience complimented some of those who spoke who likely had different views.

As well, the CAO showed a partisan point of view in his leadership by responding to concerns from one speaker who stated that the consultant under consideration by the county has been problematic because of their lack of inclusion of marginalized and minority groups. The CAO stated that the reputation of the consultant was "based on the color of the people's party." This is dismissive, and doesn't address the concerns at all. Would the CAO rather the consultant leave out Fresno County residents? Wouldn't it be better to get a consultant that has a neutral rating among community members.

Please remember that while your constituents have different political views, you represent all of all.