# MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA



## **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

16.1

During the oral communication section of the agenda for Tuesday, June 11, 2024, Eddie Apodaca spoke regarding concerns with the Sheriff and District Attorney.

ATTACHMENTS FILED WITH CLERK OF THE BOARD

Submit request to Clerk of Board (right of podium), Speakers are entitled to three (3) minutes, subject to Board Rules listed on the reverse side of this form.

SPEAKER'S NAME:_		
Address: (only if fol		
(only if fol	low-up mail respons	se requested)
City:	Zip:	
Phone #:		
Date: 6/11/24	Agenda #	
PLEASE STATE YOU	R POSITION BELC	W:
Position on "Regula	r" (non-appealed	) Agenda Item:
Support	Oppose	Neutral
<b>Note:</b> If you are he for "Appeal", please the appeal below:		
Support	Oppose	Neutral

# MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA



## **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

16.2

During the oral communication section of the agenda for Tuesday, June 11, 2024, Karla Cervantes, Franco Pacheco, Jillian Menez, Jen Larratt Smith, Debbie Walsh, Andrew Silva, Alicia Espinoza, Lindsay Robinson, Mike McCarthy and Daniele Gutierrez spoke in opposition of building warehouses and the March Joint Powers Authority project.

ATTACHMENTS FILED WITH CLERK OF THE BOARD

Submit request to Clerk of Board (right of podium), Speakers are entitled to three (3) minutes, subject to Board Rules listed on the reverse side of this form.

board Rules listed of	A ,	) los
SPEAKER'S NAME:_	MArta	aran tes
Address: (only if foll	Old Elsin	are rd
(only if foll	ow-up mail respo	onse requested)
City: Ruis	Zip:	2570
Phone # (951) 892	-9916	
Date: 6- \\ - 202	Agenda #_	Piblic Commen
PLEASE STATE YOU	R POSITION BE	LOW:
Position on "Regula	r" (non-appeal	ed) Agenda Item:
Support	Oppose	Neutral
<b>Note:</b> If you are he for "Appeal", please the appeal below:	_	
Support	Oppose _	Neutral
I give my 3 minutes	i to:	

Submit request to Clerk of Board (right of podium), Speakers are entitled to three (3) minutes, subject to Board Rules listed on the reverse side of this form.

SPEAKER'S NAME: F	ranco Pach	(0)
Address:(only if follo	w-up mail respons	se requested)
City: Percis	Zip:	2570
Phone #: 951-790	5-7757	
Date: 6-11-24	Agenda #	blic comment
PLEASE STATE YOUR	POSITION BELO	W:
Position on "Regular	" (non-appealed	) Agenda Item:
Support	Oppose	Neutral
<b>Note:</b> If you are her for "Appeal", please s the appeal below:		
Support	Oppose	Neutral
I give my 3 minutes	to:	

Submit request to Clerk of Board (right of podium), Speakers are entitled to three (3) minutes, subject to Board Rules listed on the reverse side of this form.

SPEAKER'S NAME:	Jillian	Marie	a menez
Address: Pero	ollow-up mail	response	requested)
City: Perris	Zip	925	70
Phone #: (951)5	131-121	7	
Date: 6/11/2	Agend	a # 126	lic Comunt
PLEASE STATE YOU	JR POSITIO	N BELOW	<i>i</i> :
Position on "Regul			
Support	Орро	se	Neutral
<b>Note:</b> If you are h for "Appeal", please the appeal below:			
Support _	Орро	se	Neutral
I give my 3 minute	es to:		
(Revised: 08/16/2022	)		

Submit request to Clerk of Board (right of podium), Speakers are entitled to three (3) minutes, subject to Board Rules listed on the reverse side of this form.

SPEAKER'S NAME:_	Ven larratt-8	nuth (RNOW)
Address: 7 (only if follows)	low-up mail respon	se requested)
City:	Zip:	
Phone #:		
Date: 6/11/2024	, Agenda #	sublic comment
PLEASE STATE YOU	R POSITION BELO	ow:
Position on "Regula	r" (non-appealed	d) Agenda Item:
Support	Oppose	Neutral
<b>Note:</b> If you are he for "Appeal", please the appeal below:		
Support	Oppose	Neutral
I give my 3 minutes	s to:	

Submit request to Clerk of Board (right of podium), Speakers are entitled to three (3) minutes, subject to Board Rules listed on the reverse side of this form.

SPEAKER'S NAME:_	Debbie	WARSY
Address: (only if fol	WEAD low-up mail respon	UMUQJ nse requested)
City:	Zip:	
Phone #:		
Date:	24 Agenda #	Parlhi Com
PLEASE STATE YOU		
Position on "Regula		
Support	Oppose _	Neutral
<b>Note:</b> If you are he for "Appeal", please the appeal below:		
Support	Oppose	Neutral
I give my 3 minutes	s to:	
(Revised: 08/16/2022)		

Submit request to Clerk of Board (right of podium), Speakers are entitled to three (3) minutes, subject to Board Rules listed on the reverse side of this form.


SPEAKER'S NAME	: ANDREW S	SILVA	
Address: (only if	follow-up mail response	requested)	
City: RIVERS	IDE Zip: 90	1508	
Phone #:			
Date: 6-11-2	Agenda #	6	
PLEASE STATE YOUR POSITION BELOW:			
Position on "Regu	ular" (non-appealed)	Agenda Item:	
Support	Oppose	Neutral	
<b>Note:</b> If you are here for an agenda item that is filed for "Appeal", please state separately your position on the appeal below:			
Support	Oppose	Neutral	
I give my 3 minut	tes to:		

Submit request to Clerk of Board (right of podium), Speakers are entitled to three (3) minutes, subject to Board Rules listed on the reverse side of this form.

SPEAKER'S NAME:	BPINOCA,	alicon	
Address: 1532le (only if follow Mile)	Va Palr	na Wu onse requeste 1 L	M 9255
City:	Zip:		
Phone #: 951-45  Date: 6/11/24	2-01(0) Agenda #_	? non	lo lo
PLEASE STATE YOUR			
Position on "Regular"	(non-appeal	ed) Agenda	Item:
Support	Oppose	Neut	tral
<b>Note:</b> If you are here for "Appeal", please st the appeal below:			
Support	Oppose _	Neutr	al
I give my 3 minutes t	o: <u> </u>		

Submit request to Clerk of Board (right of podium), Speakers are entitled to three (3) minutes, subject to Board Rules listed on the reverse side of this form.

SPEAKER'S NAME:	- WOSAY Rubinsm
Address:	
(only if foll	ow-up mail response requested)
. ^	2225 gzszg
Phone #:	
Date: 6 11 (24	Agenda # Now Agend
PLEASE STATE YOU	R POSITION BELOW:
Position on "Regula	r" (non-appealed) Agenda Item:
Support	OpposeNeutral
	re for an agenda item that is filed state separately your position on
Support	OpposeNeutral
I give my 3 minutes	to:
(Revised: 08/16/2022)	



Submit request to Clerk of Board (right of podium), Speakers are entitled to three (3) minutes, subject to Board Rules listed on the reverse side of this form.

SPEAKER'S NAME:_	Daniele Gu	tierrez-Singlet
Address:(only if fol	low-up mail respons	se requested)
City:	Zip:	
Phone #:		
Date: 4/11/14	Agenda #/	Public Commen
PLEASE STATE YOU		
Position on "Regula	r" (non-appealed	) Agenda Item:
Support	Oppose	Neutral
<b>Note:</b> If you are he for "Appeal", please the appeal below:		
Support	Oppose	Neutral
I give my 3 minutes	s to:	Y

# MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA



## **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

16.3

During the oral communication section of the agenda for Tuesday, June 11, 2024, Gregg Langworthy spoke regarding identity audit, recall election, vote centers, mail in ballots and USPS, and verification of signatures.

ATTACHMENTS FILED WITH CLERK OF THE BOARD

Submit request to Clerk of Board (right of podium), Speakers are entitled to three (3) minutes, subject to Board Rules listed on the reverse side of this form. SPEAKER'S NAME: Greg Languorth Address:

(only if follow-up mail response requested) City: Wildomer Zip: 72595 Phone #: Date: 6/11/2024 Agenda #\_\_\_\_\_ PLEASE STATE YOUR POSITION BELOW: Position on "Regular" (non-appealed) Agenda Item: Support Oppose Neutral Note: If you are here for an agenda item that is filed for "Appeal", please state separately your position on the appeal below: Oppose Neutral Support

(Revised: 08/16/2022)

I give my 3 minutes to:

#### **TUESDAY PUBLIC COMMENT**

- 1. VOTE CENTERS: Good process, good people, no concerns.
- 2. POST OFFICE: No public observation allowed; no ROV poll workers oversee the process, ballots given to ROV in open trays, no sealed containers with ROV paperwork confirming vote totals. Over 90% of the vote.
- 3. ROV SIGNATURE VERIFICATION: Over 90% of our ballots go through this process. Good people are required to use an insecure process.
- 4. THE PROCESS: Four signatures come up on the screen at a time, and these four signatures are judged to be either legitimate or possibly fraudulent in about 10-15 seconds.


#### 5. PROBLEMS WITH THE PROCESS:

- a. The signature checkers are not tested to determine their ability to discern, with a high level of accuracy, fraudulent signatures from legitimate ones.
- b. The ROV has not conducted an audit to determine if fraudulent ballots are unknowingly making it past the signature check gate to be counted as legal votes.

#### 6. OUR CONCLUSION AND POSSIBLE SOLUTION

- a. We believe that possibly fraudulent ballots are being counted as legitimate votes. This is the fault of a bad process, not the staff.
- b. We had hoped to work with the ROV to do an "identity audit" of this small recall election. We would work with the ROV to contact a sample number of voters who voted in this election and personally confirm that they actually voted. If some on the list say they did not vote, then that might indicate that fraudulent ballots made it through the signature check process.
- c. Yesterday we learned that Art will not meet with us until after certification of the recall election and that the ROV will not release the names of those who voted in the election until after certification.
- d. We think this audit needs to be done before certification. For Art to certify the election, he needs to know if fraudulent ballots were counted before he signs the certification.
- e. We hope the supervisors will encourage Art to work with us.

Greg Langworthy 951-704-5149 6/11/24



SPEAKER'S NAME:_	KOYID	CERKUN
SPEAKER'S NAME:_		
Address:(only if fol		
(Only II for	low-up man respons	se requested)
City:	Zip:	
Phone #:		
Date: PLEASE STATE YOU	Agenda #	Usuc
PLEASE STATE YOU	R POSITION BELO	w.Comme
	ar" (non- <mark>appeal</mark> ed	) Agenda Item:
Position on "Regula Support Note: If you are he for "Appeal", please	ar" (non-appealedOppose ere for an agenda	) Agenda Item:Neutral item that is filed
Position on "Regula	or" (non-appealedOppose ere for an agenda state separately y	) Agenda Item:Neutral item that is filed your position on

# MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA



## **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

16.4

During the oral communication section of the agenda for Tuesday, June 11, 2024, Roy Bleckert spoke regarding the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court determined the Covid vaccine was not vaccine but a treatment, and the need for more debate with the community before bringing the items to the Board to be voted on.

ATTACHMENTS FILED WITH CLERK OF THE BOARD

# MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA



## **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

16.5

During the oral communication section of the agenda for Tuesday, June 11, 2024, Tim Smith spoke regarding the logic and accuracy test with the voting machines for the March election.

ATTACHMENTS FILED WITH CLERK OF THE BOARD

Submit request to Clerk of Board (right of podium), Speakers are entitled to three (3) minutes, subject to Board Rules listed on the reverse side of this form. SPEAKER'S NAME: 1 m Smith (only if follow-up mail response requested) Address:\_\_ City: Homeland zip: 92548 Phone #: General Comment Agenda # Date: PLEASE STATE YOUR POSITION BELOW: Position on "Regular" (non-appealed) Agenda Item: Support Oppose Neutral Note: If you are here for an agenda item that is filed for "Appeal", please state separately your position on the appeal below: Oppose Neutral Support I give my 3 minutes to:

# MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA



## **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

16.6

During the oral communication section of the agenda for Tuesday, June 11, 2024, Jim Niederecker spoke regarding mailing cost for ballots, data base analysis and identity audit for the June 4 special election.

ATTACHMENTS FILED WITH CLERK OF THE BOARD

Submit request to Control Board (right of podium), Speakers are entitled to three (3) minutes, subject to Board Rules listed on the reverse side of this form.

SPEAKER'S NAME:_	Jim Nieder	recker
Address:(only if follows:	low-up mail respons	e requested)
City:	Zip:	
Phone #:		
Date:	Agenda # <u>Pur</u>	blic Comment
PLEASE STATE YOU	R POSITION BELO	w:
Position on "Regula	r" (non-appealed)	Agenda Item:
Support	Oppose	Neutral
<b>Note:</b> If you are he for "Appeal", please the appeal below:		
Support	Oppose	Neutral
I give my 3 minutes	s to:	
(Revised: 08/16/2022)		

## Lopez, Daniel

From:

Aquia Mail

Sent:

Tuesday, June 11, 2024 8:46 AM

To:

jniedere@proton.me

Cc:

Clerk of the Board

Subject:

Request to Speak Web Submission

**Attachments:** 

voting-system-accuracy-requirements-pdf.pdf



Thank you for submitting your request to speak. The Clerk of the Board office has received your request and will be prepared to allow you to speak when your item is called. To attend the meeting, please call (669) 900-6833 and use **Meeting ID # 864 4411 6015**. **Password is 20240610.** You will be muted until your item is pulled and your name is called. Please dial in at 9:00 am with the phone number you provided in the form so you can be identified during the meeting.

Submitted on June 11, 2024

Submitted values are:

**First Name** 

Jim

**Last Name** 

Niederecker

Address (Street, City and Zip)

PO Box 890337

Phone

9516753923

**Email** 

jniedere@proton.me

Agenda Date

06/11/2024

Agenda Item # or Public Comment

**Public comment** 

Attachments (Must be .pdf, .doc, or .docx)

voting-system-accuracy-requirements-pdf.pdf

Voting System Accuracy Requirement for the June 4th Special Election 6-10-24

The requirements to certify any election include the results must be accurate and the election must be conducted in compliance with all federal and state laws.

Data indicates recent elections in California may not have been accurate, i.e. there is doubt all votes were cast from eligible voters, thus impacting certification. The ROV has been working to implement a contract with Experian since last November to analyze and correct the county voter registration database. As of May 29, six months later, the contract was still not in place.

Two data sources are summarized below.

2020 Presidential Election Contrast Analysis

The report, '2020 Presidential Election Contrast Analysis' written by S. Stanley Young and Ray Blehar, demonstrates voter rolls were inflated to impact the 2020 election. The paper can be found at election-integrity.info.

The paper describes how the reliability of voting results after the 2020 election in several states (particularly swing states) has come under question. To identify any statistical anomalies, the authors analyzed state-related data for 2016 and 2020.

The authors used a method called contrast analysis.

The authors determined the contrast of Biden versus Trump in the 2020 election and compared that to Clinton versus Trump in 2016. For example, in California, the totals and the contrast were:

State	Biden 2020	Trump 2020	Clinton 2016	Trump 2016	Contrast
California	11,110,250	6,006,429	8,753,788	4,483,810	833,843


The contrast shows Biden beat Trump by  $5\pm$  million votes (2020), whereas Clinton beat Trump by  $4\pm$  million (2016). Doing the arithmetic, the contrast is 833,843 votes. (Statisticians call this the Difference of the Differences, or DoD.)

Note that Trump increased his California vote total by 1.5± million votes. However, Biden increased the Democrat candidate's vote total by 2.3± million. Where did California find 3.8± million more votes in 2020 than in 2016?

The increase is NOT explained by an increase in California's population. Census Bureau data says that the population of California increased by less than 700,000 people. (Note that this includes children not old enough to vote, non-citizens, non-registered citizens, etc.). However, the 2020 vote total for the Democrat candidate increased by 2.3± million votes. The significant vote increase does not appear to be logically explainable.

A statistical contrast is not proof of voting fraud, but a large contrast does point to situations that merit closer examination.

The authors completed a 2020 vs 2016 contrast for each State (with the exceptions of Alaska and Maine). A positive contrast indicates Biden scored more votes in 2020 than expected in that state, while a negative contrast indicates that Trump did better in 2020 than expected.



The graph below shows California produced just over 800,000 more votes than expected for Biden. The huge gap between California and the next most extreme state, Massachusetts, is most unusual. Yes, California is larger, but as noted above, there were substantially more California votes for Biden than the increase in its population.

It is evident voter rolls were inflated in California in 2020 impacting election accuracy.

#### Transparency Foundation Audit

Other data includes an audit by the Transparency Foundation. Two of many issues are summarized below. The full audit report can be viewed at: https://assets.website-files.com/639ba3621a72923685807b82/6480cc0a9742630ac2f28eaa\_TF\_Report.pdf.

#### Signature Verification Process is Unreliable

Approximately 90% of all votes cast are vote-by-mail ballots. The audit sited interviews with county election officials revealing many are overwhelmed by mail-in ballots and concede that quality control takes a backseat to accuracy. The audit showed large deviations in signature rejection rates across counties, 0.24% to 2.8%, demonstrating the verification process is not reliable. This is significant given the voter rolls are likely inflated as this process is the only control for VBM ballots. The Riverside Election Integrity team has advocated for a test to ascertain how accurate the signature verification process is, so corrective actions may be implemented as needed.

#### Voter Registration Database Errors

The audit also found the voter rolls in California are at least 9.2% in error, i.e. almost one in ten ballots mailed includes: a deceased person, someone living in another state, someone living at a vacant lot, someone underage, someone live at a PO Box, someone who voted in another

state, someone who lives with 14 others at the same address, etc. These ballots can be harvested and used to impact elections.

The Transparency Foundation audit was based on all California counties. If one assumes the Riverside voter rolls are only 5% in error, this equates to 1,079 records, (.05 x 21,578 registered voters in TA4). This number of suspect ballots would impact the special election results.

Accuracy Requirement for the Special Election

Given the concerns noted above, the importance of the Special Election, an accuracy requirement is needed to ensure proper certification of the election.

The Voting Systems Standards, Volume 1, Performance Standards, April 2002, Section 3.2.1 defines the required accuracy requirement for the voting system:

The rate is set at a significantly stringent level such that the likelihood of voting system errors affecting the outcome of an elections are exceptionally remote, even in the closest of elections.

As of this writing, 9,662 votes have been counted. The difference between the 'yes' and 'no' votes is 214 votes, (4934 - 4720). If the acceptable vote error was set at 107 votes, this could result in a tie election. Therefore, an error of 50 votes would meet the requirement to not impact the outcome of the election as noted above. Thus, the error rate is set not to exceed 0.5%, (50 / 9,662).

To verify the accuracy of the election, a canvas of voters will be conducted. Using a list of voters who voted in the Special Election, a sample of the voters will be contacted to confirm they indeed voted, I.e. a fraudulent ballot was not employed to register their vote. The sample plan will ensure the error rate is not exceeded. The canvas will not include any discussion of how the voter voted, yes or no.

The plan chosen is from 'Zero Acceptance Number Sampling Plans', 5th edition, by Nicholas L. Squeglia, published by ASQ Press. The plan treats the population of votes as a batch to be accepted using attribute sampling. This is a statistically valid method to sample the voting population to assess accuracy.

Plan summary: AQL = 0.40 n= 86 c = 0 Lot size: 3201 - 10,000

- 'AQL' is the maximum percent of non-conformities that, for the purposes of sampling inspection, can be considered satisfactory. Note: an AQL of 0.50 or 0.5% could not be chosen as this AQL plan is not available. The next closest plan that does not exceed 0.5% was chosen. This is acceptable given the plan is based on a random sample and the potential to miss a 'non-conformity' and assume the batch of ballots is accurate when it is not, is possible.
- · 'n' refers to the minimum number of voters to be sampled
- 'c' refers to the maximum number of voters allowed who replied 'I did not vote in the Special Election', in order to confirm the error rate was not exceeded. In other words, if one voter indicates they did not vote in the election, this is considered a non-conformity and the sample plan fails, i.e the specified accuracy rate is exceeded.

• Lot size refers to the range of items in the batch to be sampled. In this case, 9,662 voters is the within the lot size range.

#### Conclusion

A minimum of 86 voters who voted will be contacted to determine if they voted. If no voter indicates they did not vote, then the accuracy of the voted ballot population meets the accuracy requirement and the election outcome is not impacted.

Aquia Mail

Sent:

Monday, June 10, 2024 4:10 PM

To:

Clerk of the Board

Subject:

**Public Comments Web Submission** 



The Clerk of the Board has received your public comments and will forward them to the Board of Supervisors. If you wish to call in and speak at the Board of Supervisors meeting, please select <a href="https://rivcocob.org/request-to-speak">https://rivcocob.org/request-to-speak</a> and fill out the request to speak form.

Thank you,

Riverside County Clerk of the Board

Submitted on June 10, 2024

Submitted values are:

**First Name** 

Tiffani

**Last Name** 

LoBue

Address (Street, City and Zip)

4028 E Paseo Luisa

Phone

7608351066

**Email** 

bwtiffani@hotmail.com

**Agenda Date** 

06/11/2024

Agenda Item # or Public Comment

**Public Comment** 

State your position below

Neutral

Comments

**Regarding Animal Services Director** 

From: Aquia Mail

Sent: Monday, June 10, 2024 1:03 PM
To: jgalvan@anzelgalvan.com

Cc: Clerk of the Board

Subject: Request to Speak Web Submission



Thank you for submitting your request to speak. The Clerk of the Board office has received your request and will be prepared to allow you to speak when your item is called. To attend the meeting, please call (669) 900-6833 and use **Meeting ID # 864 4411 6015**. **Password is 20240610**. You will be muted until your item is pulled and your name is called. Please dial in at 9:00 am with the phone number you provided in the form so you can be identified during the meeting.

Submitted on June 10, 2024

Submitted values are:

#### **First Name**

Juan

#### **Last Name**

Galvan

#### **Phone**

4158158254

#### **Email**

jgalvan@anzelgalvan.com

#### **Agenda Date**

06/11/2024

#### Agenda Item # or Public Comment

Item 1 under SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING

#### Comments

I am a partner at Anzel Galvan LLP, bond counsel to the Successor Agency, and would like to available for any legal questions regarding this item.

Geraldine Davis < geri707@yahoo.com>

Sent:

Monday, June 10, 2024 12:19 PM

To:

Clerk of the Board

Subject:

**Proposed Budget** 

**CAUTION:** This email originated externally from the <u>Riverside County</u> email system. **DO NOT** click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

As a resident of Riverside County, I want to protest this proposed budget. Instead of adequately funding desperately needed resources, like housing, transit, healthcare, and QUALITY education

this budget pushes most monies toward law enforcement, incarceration facilities and anything, but where the monies really need to be spent. Please do not pass this budget without revisions that would help the people of Riverside County.

Our sheriff is running for Governor, not doing the job we pay him to do. He should not be voicing his political views, we don't pay him to do that and he should be disciplined for doing so.

Geraldine Davis 74144 Angels Camp Road Palm Desert

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad

Aquia Mail

Sent:

Wednesday, June 5, 2024 10:38 AM

To:

Clerk of the Board

Subject:

Webform submission from: Contact

Follow Up Flag:

Follow up

Flag Status:

Flagged

A Contact Form was submitted.

Submitted on June 5, 2024

Submitted values are:

**Your Email** 

jzcarlos58@gmail.com

**Your Name** 

Jorge Carlos

#### Subject

Political Comments by Riverside County Sheriff Bianco

#### Message

Sheriff Bianco once took an oath to support and to defend the Constitution of the United States. His decision to make a public comment, while wearing a Riverside County Sheriff Uniform announcing that he would be voting for a felon for President of the United States was wrong. Seeing the most powerful law enforcement official in Riverside County vent is right-wing ideology makes one question if this man can be trusted to enforce the law in a fair and just manner! It is tragic to see that the divisive ideological forces committed destruction of American Democracy have taken root in the mind of the Riverside County Sheriff.

Aquia Mail

Sent:

Thursday, June 6, 2024 11:47 AM

To:

Clerk of the Board

Subject:

Webform submission from: Contact

Follow Up Flag:

Follow up

Flag Status:

Flagged

A Contact Form was submitted.

Submitted on June 6, 2024

Submitted values are:

Your Email

evanise@yahoo.com

**Your Name** 

**Eva Smith** 

#### Subject

Chad Bianco Support for Felons

#### Message

I am a concerned Riverside County resident. I am writing because I am concerned about the recent comments Sheriff Chad Bianco made on his Instagram profile in uniform. I am writing to request an investigation. These types of posts need to stop. He is a public servant. He should not have made these statements in uniform.

He said he supports felons and then went on a rant about the Governor, politics and his support for felons. My daughter's father is in law enforcement. I have many friends in law enforcement throughout Southern California. Non of them have ever made statements like this.

His whole message of "law and order" went out the door! His video and subsequent interview is conduct unbecoming an officer and gives the badge a bad name. Supporting a felon also casts doubt on his integrity, honesty, moral judgment and character. It also discredits the Riverside Sheriff to the agency. Other RSOs may also feel obligated to follow along which impairs the agency's efficient and effective operation.

As a member of the community who also supports law enforcement AND law and order — this is a bad look on Riverside County Sheriff's deputies.

Please investigate.

Aquia Mail

Sent:

Friday, June 7, 2024 1:42 PM

To:

Clerk of the Board

Subject:

Webform submission from: Contact

Follow Up Flag:

Follow up

Flag Status:

Flagged

A Contact Form was submitted.

Submitted on June 7, 2024

Submitted values are:

**Your Email** 

ckeehan@yahoo.com

Your Name

Colleen M Keehan

#### Subject

**Sheriff Bianco** 

#### Message

Will you be addressing the comments Sheriff Bianco made about his endorsement of putting a delon in the white house? While in a county vehicle and wearing his uniform?

Thank you.

Aquia Mail

Sent:

Friday, June 7, 2024 5:53 PM

To:

Clerk of the Board

Subject:

Webform submission from: Contact

A Contact Form was submitted.

Submitted on June 7, 2024

Submitted values are:

Your Email

jeannemarkel@gmail.com

**Your Name** 

Jeanne Markel

Subject

Violation of Code

#### Message

Good Evening,

I noticed Sheriff Chad Bianco posted a very political post to his personal instagram this past week - he was in his sheriff's uniform, when he endorsed a presidential candidate. In referring to his support for presumed GOP nominee Donald Trump, he noted that "It's time we put a felon in the White House". My understanding is that CA Govt Code 3206 states that "No officer or employee of a local agency shall participate in political activities of any kind while in uniform". Though Bianco was voted into office, I presume he is still considered an officer and/or an employee?

I would appreciate understanding if it's the Riverside Board of Supervisors or another agency that he reports into from a perspective of disciplinary action - if not, please let me know who handles these types of issues for his position. I would like to understand if this violation is currently in process or not, particularly as the Board has just voted to give the role holder in this office a 27% bump in compensation.

I look forward to hearing back from you - thank you for your time.

Jeanne Markel, Concerned Citizen