Written Public Comment
Provided for the October 20, 2026,
Los Angeles County Sheriff Civilian Oversight Commission.

To submit written public comment for the official meeting record, complete the form at https://bit.ly/3SsCyNm. For any questions, please email cocnotify@coc.lacounty.gov or call (213) 253-5678

What agenda item or topic will you comment on?	Provide your public comment below. Please do not share any sensitive personally identifiable information because this comment will be made public as part of the official meeting record.	What is your name?
Public comment, family impact,	I would like to speak during the meeting. My rights have not been upheld for my case, I was protected by criminal protection order domestic violence MA079850	Olivia Irene Fitzsimmons
General comments	Is there a way to get in contact with members of the commission via individual email? We would like to personally email about ongoing systemic concerns we have experienced with the LASD. We understand if members do not wish to publicly announce their emails, so we welcome emails to our own advocacy organization, The California Public Integrity Council. Our email is: californiapublicintegrity@gmail.com	
What's the point of the Sheriff's Department?	My wife was recently almost murdered due to criminals confusing her car for someone else's. She thankfully survived with minor wounds. What did the sheriff department do to help? Nothing. They towed her car to one of their friendly tow yards that donates to their police fund sure nothing wrong there. Not only did the Sheriff department fail to administer even first aid they have so far 0 arrests, 0 information 0 calls to my wife 0s across the board. But sheriff department made sure to charge my wife to get her vehicle out and the tow yard wants their cut over $1000 to have you get shot in your own vehicle. So if you can't arrest anyone and you can't help anyone, why should you be funded?	
Flock Cameras in Altadena	I am a resident of Altadena, currently rebuilding my house after it was destroyed in the utility-caused fire named Eaton Fire in January 2025. I am voicing my strong opposition to the city's use of Flock Safety automated license plate readers. I want to be clear: I am not here to be anti-safety. I am advocating for governance, accountability, and evidence-based solutions. And the evidence surrounding Flock cameras is deeply concerning. First, these cameras do not selectively target suspected criminals. They capture and store the routine, daily movements of innocent residents going to work, dropping kids off at school, and visiting the doctor. It is indiscriminate mass surveillance. Worse, cities across the country are dealing with a severe lack of data sovereignty. In places like Texas, officials were shocked to discover that hundreds of unauthorized, out-of-state agencies were quietly accessing their local data. With Flock now actively pushing to integrate	

	always-listening microphones into their hardware, we are watching this system creep from traffic monitoring into neighborhood wiretapping. Second, the safeguards against abuse are failing. Organizations like the Institute for Justice and the EFF have documented rampant misuse across the country. Officers have been fired or criminally charged for using this exact system to stalk ex-partners, track people seeking reproductive healthcare, and surveil political protesters. Third, despite the company's aggressive marketing, independent academic research shows that this massive surveillance expansion does not reduce violent crime. What it does produce are database errors that lead to traumatic false arrests. Across the country, innocent people have been held at gunpoint in front of their children due to misreads and poorly maintained databases. Before this council commits another taxpayer dollar to this technology, you owe the public on-the-record answers to three specific questions: 1. Where is the cost-benefit analysis? How do you justify recurring subscription fees when independent studies show no reduction in violent crime, instead of funding resources that address crime's root causes? 2. Who owns our data? Exactly which out-of-state agencies, federal entities, or private corporations have access to our residents' locations? 3. Where is the accountability? If an authorized user abuses this system to stalk a local resident, how will the city independently find out, and what are the strict, codified penalties? Real public safety does not require treating every resident as a suspect. Thank you.	

The audit report presented in September covering ALPR usage within LASD between Jan and June	The sampling methodology used is insufficient to detect low incident violations of department policy and the conclusions they draw from it are directly refuted by their own findings of 8 unclear or insufficient purpose statements. The fact that 8 samples required follow up is an admission that the state statute was likely violated as it demands a purpose be stated in order to comply with the law regarding the usage of ALPRs. 8/300 gives 2.66% of samples records were not sufficient to meet the expectations of the statute. If this is representative of the data as a whole, there could be up to ~2000 (+- margin of error) violations of state code within the 77562 queries made. The COC must demand a comprehensive audit of the audit log, not a small fraction, not a sampling. The whole thing. The citizens of LA County deserve better.	James Monroe
WHO OVERSEES PROPERTY TAXES? PROP TAXES WENT UP ALMOST 3 X PREVIOUS YEARS.	RATE OF INCREASE IS LIMITED TO 2%, ISN'T IT? IT SHOULD TAKE TO DOUBLE 35+ YEARS. AGREE"	
Item 7 (Sheriff's Update) and Item 10.C.viii (Technology Ad Hoc Committee): LASD use of Flock Safety ALPR and video systems in contract cities, including West Hollywood Station	I am a West Hollywood community member and investigative writer. West Hollywood is a contract city, and the West Hollywood Sheriff's Station operates the City's Flock Safety ALPR and live-video systems and administers access. The City's March 16, 2026 staff report disclosed that 14 out-of-state agencies, one of them federal, accessed West Hollywood's Flock data between December 2023 and February 2026 without notice to the City, and that one Flock account covers all LASD stations and contract cities. LASD's September 23, 2026 semiannual ALPR audit reviewed only Motorola Vigilant queries and does not mention Flock. I ask the Commission to bring LASD's use of Flock systems in contract cities inside the ALPR oversight the Board directed on September 16, 2025; to agendize, or refer to its Technology Ad Hoc, a report from LASD on that use; and to set a date for LASD's written response. My full letter dated October 17, 2026, with 19 specific requests and exhibits, is attached or has been sent to cocnotify@coc.lacounty.gov. Please include it in the record for the October 20, 2026 meeting. Nik Roybal (they/them)	Nik Roybal (they/them)

Oversight of the Sheriff's Department: the Joint Regional Intelligence Center (Fusion Center) and the Office of Inspector General	In April 2022 the Board of Supervisors raised privacy concerns about the Sheriff's Fusion Center, the Joint Regional Intelligence Center, and ordered its Inspector General to monitor it. In October 2022 the Sheriff barred the Inspector General from the department's records and buildings. The Auditor-Controller's review that followed states: "we did not review the privacy implications of JRIC operations." In 2025 the County cut ten positions from the Inspector General's office. NOBODY HAS EXAMINED JRIC'S PRIVACY PRACTICES SINCE. I ask the Commission to take up oversight of the Fusion Center's handling of suspicious activity reports on county residents, and the access the Inspector General needs to do it. The reporting, with sources, is at surveillancetoday.news. Editor, Surveillance Today (Audit Veritas) https://surveillancetoday.news	

	PUBLIC COMMENT — OCTOBER 20, 2026 Los Angeles County Sheriff Civilian Oversight Commission Re: Agenda Items 8A and 9B — County Counsel, Subpoena Enforcement, and Outside Legal Counsel Accountability Chair Johnson and Commissioners: I support the Commission's efforts to enforce its subpoenas, obtain the outside law firm's assessment of the Office of Constitutional Policing, and preserve meaningful independent oversight of the Sheriff's Department. After reviewing the public records, including Chair Johnson's 114-page sworn declaration and the reported Superior Court proceedings, I believe the public deserves answers to several fundamental questions. Chair Johnson's declaration alleges that the Commission directed its assigned attorney to seek judicial enforcement of its subpoenas, but County Counsel instructed that attorney not to file the action. That allegation remains disputed, but it raises a serious question: When County Counsel and the Commission disagree, who has the authority to direct the Commission's legal representation? The civil grand jury's recommendation that the Commission have independent legal staff underscores the importance of resolving that question. I am equally concerned about the outside law firm's assessment referenced by Sheriff Luna but reportedly withheld from the Commission. Who retained that firm? Who authorized the engagement? What was the scope of the assignment? How much public money was spent? Who controls the resulting report, and what specific legal basis is being asserted for withholding it?	
LASD oversight and transparency		Lorie Atwater

	I respectfully request that the Commission seek the engagement documents, applicable authorizations, expenditure records, and a written explanation identifying any claimed confidentiality protections. Any portions that can lawfully be disclosed should be made available. Finally, LASD's own 2026 complaint-process audits have documented significant deficiencies in complaint handling and timeliness. These findings warrant independent examination of how complaints are received, recorded, transferred, investigated, and resolved. Accountability cannot depend entirely upon assurances from the very institutions subject to oversight. Identify the act. Identify the actor. Identify the authority. Produce the receipts. The public deserves meaningful oversight supported by independent access to records, clearly defined legal authority, and verifiable answers. Thank you for your continued work toward transparency and accountability.	

Veterans that are incarcerated.	As a county and state city officials are notified as to how many individuals that are incarcerated are being released back into the community. If you ask the same leaders, "How many active military are being discharged, they have no clue as to how many will be returning to their cities." My comment is simple, why don't we track the service member better and support them during the transition which will definitely reduce the number of incarceration among military personal. Another question is this, "are veterans vetted during the booking process?" I understand everyone is treated as inmate, but in contrast we go out of our way again for the gang affiliate and separate them for the safety of the other inmates, other deputies, in order to reduce jail violence. Just something to think about, career criminals often get better treatment, support, warm handoffs, special housing depending on what gang you are affiliated with, than veterans and many who have deployed and may be going through a "transition problem." Most veteran do not receive any care or support unless they are registered at the VA, many people feel veterans have all the benefits that's not necessarily true.	Jesse
	Hello, There was a glitch on my end with being able to speak during the live meeting, so I Hope by emailing this, it could be part of the record. This is Deanna Brock, mother of Emmett Brock. I would like to thank each of you on the commission for continuing this long fight in pursuing the subpoenas for my son Emmett Brock, Joseph Perez, and Andres Guardado. A special thank you to Robert Bronner and Sean Kennedy in your many hours of work on this. LASD claims they want to provide transparency to the community, but when information is requested in Use of Force allegations, county counsel fights providing that information at every step. Even with the passing of measure R, then AB 847 becoming law, they still fight releasing the information. They hide behind Meet and Confer, but there has been no Meet and Confer! Only two meetings with the last one being in March?? Meet and Confer is being used as a stall tactic. I would like to apologize for the seventh continuance in the date of the sentencing of former	Deanna Brock

	deputy Joseph Benza. Please attend if at all possible. Emmett and I will be reading our victim impact statements which will be very difficult and we could really use the extra support. Last, I want to say that I take offense to the caller that was bringing forth issues that are outside of the scope of the COC. The comment, " jails can be fixed, but what about Trump??" The comment was extremely disrespectful and insensitive to the work the COC does on behalf of our community and the affected families. Thank you,	