

From: [Priscilla Rocco](#)
To: [CITY CLERK](#)
Subject: Flock Out of Costa Mesa #2
Date: Tuesday, August 4, 2026 9:11:04 AM

Good evening City Council,

Remember that time I sent information warning *you* and the *planning commission* that 'free money' was *blinding you into authorizing* more than 60 cannabis shops in Costa Mesa? Remember how *your* decision inadvertently re-directed city staff *away* from the Housing Element for a year, *angered* residents, *and* brought more lawsuits to the City, which *we* ended up paying with our tax dollars?

Now I know that after some time on the dais, council members' vision adjusts to only seeing the shining City of the Arts. But down here in the trenches, Costa Mesans are struggling to survive.

Billions of our tax dollars have been rerouted *from* our needs, that of hungry children, cancer and ebola victims, and the elderly, and directed *toward* Trump's dismantling of our Democracy:

- He started an illegal war;
- abolished women's bodily autonomy;
- replaced experts in the military with Fox news hosts;
- sent DOGE to steal our Social Security information;
- tried his political enemies, like Dr. Fauci;
- and built his own private militia.

Do I have to remind you that the Flock system *was designed to share* data, NOT *to secure it*. And the *only* goal of the company - and its backers - is PROFIT. Full stop! How can you *NOT* see that *THIS IS* the government surveillance system outlined in Project 2025?!

John Oliver reported on 'Last Week Tonight' that FLock cameras are *always* installed in a city *without* public knowledge, *or* input. They're *always* concentrated in minority communities. And although police say Flock is indispensable to their work, the license plate readers are incorrect 35 -37% of the time.

Without *our* approval, *you* are using *our* tax dollars to violate *our* 4th Amendment Rights against warrantless search and seizure; while presenting Trump with another taxpayer-funded weapon to jail anyone he wishes!

If Trump ignores the Law, Congress, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights, what makes you think a *new* Flock contract, *new* access rules, and more oversight will protect *us* from HIM?! The *ONLY* thing stopping Trump from weaponizing *this* system against *anyone* nationwide, is an emergency order.

I used to document the life-cycle of enormous mainframe computer systems, like TRW Credit Services. And I'm telling you, if this council votes to *keep* Flock, the damage won't be confined to Costa Mesa, it will put another nail in the coffin of our Democracy itself.

First they came for the criminals... and I did nothing. Then they came for the immigrants... and I did nothing. Then they came for me...

Priscilla Rocco

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

From: [M.Thompson](#)
To: [CITY CLERK](#)
Subject: Flock Camera Vote
Date: Monday, August 3, 2026 1:36:05 PM

I am more than unhappy with the current city council attitude regarding continuance of Flock Cameras in our city. They are not necessary and have not been shown that they improve city safety. They cost money. What is fascinating to me is the record of emails between Flock and the City Council and also, the many unrecorded phone calls!

What are you trying to pull?

I have lived in Costa Mesa for 25 years in the Freedom Home Tract. This city is full of diversity which makes it the unique and very cool place it is. I grew up in Newport and owned two homes there. Retired in this wonderfully quiet hood for good! Newport Beach's current city council is just shameless, and I hope we aren't headed in that direction.

You've heard from your constituents. No one wants those Flock Cameras. Do you realize what you are exposing our community to by agreeing to keep them? There is no limit to the potential for this technology to go rogue.

Politicians don't look towards the future but Leaders do. I met and visited with John Stephens many years ago at a yard sale. I thought he was a man of the people and have been supportive of him until now, but I no longer support him because of this little theatre act of listening to constituents but then completely disregarding reasonable, well thought out input. How disappointing. Just when I thought Costa Mesa was really getting it together we get this! It is not a modern invention to make life safer or make policing easier, it is an invention that someone wants to sell us to get rich on. Don't you see that?

Meridee Thompson
merideethompson@gmail.com

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

From: [Anne Stenton](#)
To: [CITY COUNCIL](#)
Cc: [CONSTITUENT SERVICES](#); [CITY CLERK](#)
Subject: August 4th 2026 Public Comment
Date: Monday, August 3, 2026 8:26:14 AM

Mayor Stephens and Councilmembers,

I am writing to you again regarding the City's contract with Flock.

I had a few takeaways in reflecting on the July 21 City Council meeting.

First, I was incredibly proud of my fellow Costa Mesa residents who attended and spoke up for hours on this topic. I heard voices from many different walks of life expressing concerns about how Flock negatively impacts personal safety, privacy, due process, and prioritizing corporate profit over community needs. These are all valid concerns.

Second, the resounding, overwhelming message from your constituents was simple: **we don't want mass surveillance in Costa Mesa.**

Last I checked, City Council members have a duty to listen to and respect the wishes of their community. While I appreciate that the Council is reviewing the Flock contract for ways to improve the language, that is not what your residents asked for. **We asked you to cancel the contract and not replace it.**

We are moms, dads, sisters, brothers, daughters, sons, and cousins. We work, volunteer, and serve in our communities. We are not, as Garret Langley, Flock CEO, wrote in a December 5, 2025, email, people who "...want to defund the police, weaken public safety, and normalize lawlessness."

We care deeply about public safety. But mass surveillance doesn't guarantee that. In the [July 28, 2026, article by Matt Scott](#) the author reviews FBI data from Atlanta, where 28,000 Flock cameras have failed to significantly improve crime clearance rates. In another article describing the same FBI data, [Joe Wilkins writes](#) "For homicide, the numbers are especially embarrassing, with the FBI reporting case closures at just 48 percent in 2025, down from 53.4 percent in 2021. Meanwhile, rape remained flat year over year, holding steady at a pitiful 37.7 percent closure rate from 2021 to 2025, and dipping down to just 21.2 percent at its lowest point in that four-year span."

Where is the data that shows ALPR tech is an effective use of taxpayer dollars?

I respectfully ask the Council to consider the following:

- Your community doesn't want this.

This is an expensive program.

- The data doesn't show a clear benefit.

You were given the trust of this community. We put you in positions of power to lead us, not to be politicians.

I respectfully urge you to cancel the Flock contract. Costa Mesa residents do not want this.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Anne Stenton
Costa Mesa Resident

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

From: [Alex Brown](#)
To: [CITY CLERK](#)
Subject: Public comment for the city council meeting
Date: Friday, July 31, 2026 12:57:28 PM

This city has **wisely** chosen not to use the county animal shelter (OC Animal Care).

Well done!

The latest news is **a good reminder** why the city did well to stay away from OC Animal Care. The OC Animal Care director appears to reside in Texas. You can't make this stuff up.

Voice of OC, July 30, 2026

Does Orange County's Animal Care Director Live in California?

<https://voiceofoc.org/2026/07/does-orange-countys-animal-care-director-live-in-california/>

The head of Orange County's embattled animal shelter is facing questions over remote work, with questions about how much time she spends between Texas and California.

- FOR EVEN MORE INFORMATION:

[OCShelter.com](#) has a collection of recent articles — and a complete list you can download.

Below is just a sample. **Advocates have caught the shelter director in flagrant lies** many times before. There's a pattern here.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

From: drags_miner2q@icloud.com
To: [CITY CLERK](#)
Subject: Ongoing Misuse and Lack of Enforcement Regarding Guest Parking Permits
Date: Monday, August 3, 2026 7:07:38 AM

To the City Council and City Management,

I am writing to submit a formal public comment regarding a chronic code enforcement and neighborhood safety issue on Princeton Drive and surrounding streets adjacent to the Orange County Fairgrounds.

The City implemented preferential resident-only parking restrictions in neighborhoods surrounding the Fairgrounds to prevent fairgoers from inundating residential streets. Under this program, residents receive permanent vehicle permits as well as guest parking permits.

While the intent of the program is sound, the handling of guest parking permits remains deeply flawed and vulnerable to abuse across the entire area. Residents at 266 Princeton Drive have repeatedly monetized guest parking permits by providing them to fairgoers for personal profit over multiple years, an activity that becomes most flagrant on peak days such as opening and closing weekends of the Fair. Furthermore, common neighborhood knowledge suggests that the residents of 266 Princeton Drive maintain close personal relationships with individuals within the enforcement division, which many residents believe accounts for the persistent lack of accountability.

Despite the City's move toward a digital portal, deprecated paper passes remain in full view on dashboards. Enforcement officers on the ground continue to accept these invalid permits. While I may not fully grasp every internal administrative update on how guest passes are currently managed or verified behind the scenes, that uncertainty does not change the core reality: effective enforcement is simply not happening on our streets.

This ongoing breakdown directly undermines the purpose of the permit system and causes significant disruption for surrounding residents, resulting in:

- **Severe Parking Shortages:** Residents on Princeton Drive and surrounding blocks who legitimately need street parking are left without available spaces.
- **Safety & Access Hazards:** Vehicles are frequently parked illegally or encroaching on adjacent driveways throughout the neighborhood, creating line-of-sight visual hazards and blocking safe driveway ingress and egress.

I respectfully ask the City Council and City Management to address the following questions for the record:

1. **Accountability & Conflict of Interest:** Why has the City been unable to effectively investigate and penalize the ongoing misuse and sale of guest parking permits at 266 Princeton Drive despite years of recurring activity, particularly on high-volume days like the opening and closing of the Fair, and what measures are taken to ensure enforcement actions remain impartial given widespread neighborhood concerns regarding personal relationships between violators and enforcement staff?
2. **System Enforcement & Transition Gaps:** Why are deprecated or physical paper guest passes still being honored by field enforcement personnel, and what immediate

operational steps will the City take to ensure that guest permit rules are strictly enforced during the current Fair season?

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter. I request that this communication be entered into the public record for the upcoming City Council meeting. Please confirm receipt of this email.

Sincerely,

A Concerned Costa Mesa Resident

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

From: [Daniel Pietenpol](#)
To: [CITY CLERK](#)
Subject: August 4th meeting - Ordinance approving amendments to Title 13 (Planning, Zoning and Development)
Date: Thursday, July 30, 2026 10:33:34 AM

Dear Councilmembers,

Thank you to the planning department for proactively addressing the changing business environment and making Costa Mesa a more hospitable place to do business.

The updated Definitions, Citywide Land Use Matrix, and Non-Residential Parking Standards provide both new and existing businesses with clear guidelines on how to operate in our city.

As a small business owner, I appreciate your understanding of the challenges we face and the value we bring to the community, including:

- Local multiplier effect: Money spent at local businesses stays in the city longer because owners utilize nearby services.
- Job creation: Small firms hire local workers, which reduces commute times and supports families.
- Tax revenue: Sales and property taxes fund essential services like police, schools, and roads.
- Unique character: Independent shops give neighborhoods a distinct identity.

I hope you will support the revisions and improvements in Ordinance 26-327.

Best regards,

Daniel Pietenpol
Owner and Manager of six buildings in Downtown Costa Mesa
714-308-2708

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

From: [Austin Mattison](#)
To: [Neighborhoods](#)
Cc: [STEPHENS, JOHN](#); [CITY CLERK](#); [PC Public Comments](#); [APublicComments@costamesaca.gov](#)
Subject: Comment on the NWWAB plan
Date: Monday, August 3, 2026 2:15:53 PM

Hi Michelle,

Please pass these comments on to the Planning Commission, City Council, and the Mayor:

Mayor Stephens, Council Members, and Planning Commissioners,

My name is Austin Mattison, and I am a resident of West Costa Mesa. While I agree that Costa Mesa must address housing needs—and I support thoughtful redevelopment—I am deeply concerned about the current "Neighborhoods Where We All Belong" proposal. As written, this plan disproportionately places the city's housing burden onto West Costa Mesa. This directly contradicts the core intentions of the State's Housing Element guidelines, which mandate that high-density rezoning be concentrated near major transit corridors and transportation centers, not tucked away into established, independent neighborhoods. By forcing it here, the proposal risks undermining the exact qualities that make our community one of the most unique, livable areas in Orange County.

But this is not another NIBMY email; we need more affordable housing. The problem only focuses on compliance, meanwhile ignoring aspects that will create huge future livability issues.

The City's vision heavily promotes mixed-use development as a tool to create walkable neighborhoods. However, the economic reality is very different. Because residential development yields the highest returns, developers naturally prioritize housing over retail. Consequently, projects advertised as "live-work" often deliver little to no meaningful commercial space. I see this firsthand as a resident of the Lighthouse development, where **not a single one of the 40+ units is occupied by a commercial business today.**

West Costa Mesa already possesses authentic walkability along 19th Street and Placentia Avenue, where residents can easily walk to grocery stores, coffee shops, restaurants, and entertainment venues. These organic, local businesses cannot simply be engineered later through design guidelines or ground-floor retail mandates. In fact, replacing these commercial properties with high-density residential projects will reduce walkability by forcing residents to drive farther for daily necessities.

Furthermore, this plan seriously underestimates the importance of "third places"—the informal gathering spaces that build community, culture, and social connection. West Costa Mesa's character was built by artists, musicians, entrepreneurs, and small businesses, not by luxury apartment projects.

Local institutions like the Quonset Hut Village on 17th Street, The Wayfarer, the Tiki Bar, Wilson Coffee, MoonGoat, Eagle & Pig, and Trenta are not accidental. They exist because West Costa Mesa has historically offered older commercial buildings, industrial spaces, and modest strip centers that remain affordable enough for independent businesses to survive and grow. This is the exact environment where legendary Costa Mesa brands like Volcom and RVCA got their start.

The economics of the proposed rezoning place these invaluable community assets at immense risk. When investors can replace aging commercial properties with high-density luxury apartments, culture and creativity cannot compete with those financial returns. Over time, the artist villages, local music venues, and independent markets will disappear, replaced by high-return projects that contribute nothing to our culture.

Housing units alone do not create community; third places do. If every aging shopping center and industrial building becomes housing, we may meet state housing targets while simultaneously destroying the very ingredients that make Costa Mesa a desirable place to live.

If the City moves forward with these zoning changes, I respectfully ask that four revisions be considered:

1. **Provide stronger protections** for existing neighborhood-serving retail centers that offer daily necessities. Don't create food deserts and more car trips.
2. **Require meaningful, economically viable commercial space** within mixed-use developments, rather than allowing token retail components that remain permanently vacant.
3. **Identify and protect cultural, artistic, and entertainment uses** that contribute directly to Costa Mesa's identity.
4. **Evaluate the cumulative impacts** of commercial and industrial land conversion on neighborhood livability, walkability, entrepreneurship, and culture—not just housing production.

Cities must evolve, but housing alone does not make a great city. The question before you should not just be how many units we can build, but what kind of city will remain once they are built. Once our unique character, local businesses, and authentic culture are lost, they cannot be rebuilt. If this plan goes forward unaltered, it will strip away the soul of our neighborhood and leave us looking no different than the endless housing of Yorba Linda or the sterile blandness of Aliso Viejo. Costa Mesa is better than that, and we can do better than this plan. I urge you to revise this proposal to protect our neighborhood-serving retail and creative spaces before they are gone for good.

Thank you for your consideration,

Austin Mattison
West Costa Mesa Resident

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.