

Members of the PSJAB and County Staff,

I know that some of you will not wish to read this e-mail, but if you are interested in the **truth** please read until the end. Known for verbosity, I shall endeavor to keep this as succinct as possible.

You received from Maureen Rupe on May 7, 2015 an e-mail with the following message:

“With great regret, I must resign from the PSJ Dependent Special District Advisory Board. My decision has nothing to do with the Brevard County Staff that does an excellent job. My problem is fellow Advisory Board Member Mr. Pete Costello. For many years we have been political adversaries, but now Mr. Costello’s actions have taken it to another level that has devastated my family and myself, is not something that any decent person would do.

“I cannot work with Mr. Costello and concentrate on the issues. I feel this explanation is necessary as I have never in 30 years, resigned from an obligation to the county.

“Maureen Rupe
“7185 Bright Ave
“Cocoa, Florida 32927
“(321) 639-6839”

On June 17, 2015, I received the e-mail from Pete Costello. Not knowing what Mr. Costello had allegedly done, I wrote to Comm. Fisher’s office a Sunshine Law request asking for all e-mails FROM Maureen Rupe TO Comm. Fisher’s office from April 18, 2015 to June 18, 2015 and received a copy of the e-mail above, with attachments, and a second e-mail, below. First, the attachments: a [search engine result](#) and a [page from my website](#). (Did you receive those attachments with her resignation?) Please note that neither item points to anything to do with Pete Costello. Also, you may not know that after one of the last PSJAB meetings she attended, Maureen asked to speak to Pete Costello and what she said was that she wanted *me* to remove *my* website. She wanted Pete to make me remove my website, MaureenRupeExposed.com and went on and on and worked herself up into a frenzy, even ranting while she went to and got into her car.

The second e-mail (sent to Marcia DAY and D1’s office on May 11, 2015):

“Hi Marcia,

“I see she has taken down a lot of her ranting's about me, lucky I have them.

“Costello has warned her.

“Read what she said when I asked her to take the exposed off. What she accused me off, bottom of page.

“Also a deputy friend told me to find the host and appeal to them .

“Found they are Globe net who are in PSJ, and in the Business report to support.

“Oh well, I have had enough of her slander.

“Cheerio
“Maureen”

Please note again, that her response is all about me, Linda McKinney.

I am not certain that you fully understand her allegations. In order to help you do so, I send the following. She alleges:

"----- Original Message -----
"Subject: Maureen Rupe Exposed
"From: "Maureen Rupe" rupe32927@earthlink.net
"Date: Fri, [February 15, 2013 7:19 am](#)
"To: editor@psjhistory.com

"Hello Ms Mckinney,

"I don't know if you have Costello's permission to put up his website on PSJ History, or SCC.

"I have found out that in the past 4 years, since you have his site, MRE on your SCC website, multiple times.

"Maureen Rupe Exposed has gone to many sites as a porn site. It also has my name, address, and my house on aerial view.

"You may think this is hilarious, due to your nature. I do not, I feel threatened, harassed, cyber stalked and with my present health can not ignore this final insult.

"Maureen Rupe
"I do not have Costello's email, please pass on."

And in *part of* another e-mail:

"From: Maureen Rupe
"Sent: Monday, July 01, 2013 12:04 PM
"To: Lindy
"Subject: Pitiful

["Your problem is,](#) and it will prove to be a very serious one for you, you embellish and turn everything I say into a What you think and What you want me to mean. For example let's take the "Maureen Rupe Exposed" site. When I said it had gone to porn sites, which it had in the related sites and I have printed proof, you couldn't leave it there could you? Your diatribe even stated I have nude photos of myself, which you had better come up with, as you will need them. Does your husband know what you wrote about me? How would he feel if someone wrote that about you? I should ask him. This libelous defamation of my

character is coming to an end. Plus an attorney who is the son of a friend, saw the site Maureen Rupe Exposed whilst looking at porn sites for a case. He is willing to be a witness in court. That is how I found out."

Please note that she states in the first e-mail "Maureen Rupe Exposed has gone to many sites as a porn site." And in the second e-mail "When I said it had gone to porn sites, which it had in the related sites and I have printed proof", she is referring to the [search engine results](#) she alleges is proof of her assertions. To prove her assertions **incorrect**, please understand how search engine results can be "stacked" (you may have recently seen news stories about how [Google has been doing so for years](#)) via paying the company for advertising. Please note that on the search engine results at the top of the page are the words, "Bright House, Road Runner, Web, Sponsored Links". That last term, "Sponsored Links" tells you that those ads are **paid for**, contracted through Bright House network to appear in the search results that return on even a remotely related search request; in this case, as evidenced by the bolded word in the search results, the word "exposed". Exposed has no definitive connection to pornography since it has more uses than sexual connotation. Neither Pete Costello nor I had anything to do with the **contracted** search results.

Also, if you will note in her second allegation of February 15, 2013, that Maureen states, "Plus an attorney who is the son of a friend, saw the site Maureen Rupe Exposed whilst looking at porn sites for a case." The important portion: "whilst looking at porn sites for a case".

The website [LifeHacker.com](#) explains one of the way cookies work:

"Because cookies are always sent back to the site that originated them, an advertiser's cookie will be sent back to them from every web site you visit that is also using that same advertiser. This allows the advertiser to track the sites you visit, **and send targeted advertising based on the types of sites that you visit.** [my bolding]"

When the attorney saw anything relating porn to MaureenRupeExposed.com, it was *not* because there is any actual connection between the two but because *cookies from porn sites were already on his computer* and the search engine found things that were related to his interests as exposed in the cookies on his computer. Remember when you shop for shoes, purses, craft items, car parts, or cat supplements online then check your Yahoo mail account and see related advertisements on the sidebar? Cookies on your computer tell Yahoo which advertisers to display to you in that sidebar.

Also, I'll add a quick note about website terminology, if I may. Maureen wrote to me telling me that MaureenRupeExposed.com "has gone to many sites as a porn site" and "had gone to porn sites". As a webmaster, that's telling me that my site is LINKED to porn sites, which I know for certain it is **not**. A link takes you from one website to another, thus her assertion that my site "has gone to" I knew for certain was false. I do the links on my websites and on a third website that I also webmaster. I know there are no links to porn sites on any of my websites, so why should I remove my website when I knew the assertions were false?

As to the May 11, 2015 e-mail to Marcia DAY and D1 recommending that they read what I wrote about her on my website page, I hope you will remember that my reaction was logical. I followed the natural progression of the conversation. For instance, if I give you the numbers “1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7” the next logical number is? The logical progression of a conversation is similar. If someone accuses you of stealing their plate of spaghetti and eating it, do you respond by talking about ceiling fans? No. You respond to their allegation. That is what I did. It was the first time she alleged a porn connection and I was responding by asking questions about the allegation. Did I know anything after the first accusation (the e-mail dated Feb. 15, 2013) arrived concerning the alleged “evidence”? No. She didn’t mention anything about an “attorney” at that time, nor did she send along her search engine results. Asking questions was an appropriate response, and questions I did ask.

I have asked Maureen Rupe to prove her most recent allegation, apparently given in a phone conversation to Marcia NEWELL of D1’s office. I found out about the most recent allegation via an e-mail received July 8, 2015 from Cristina Berrios that contained this e-mail from Marcia Newell to Comm. Fisher:

“Costello’s term is up in 2017.

“Talked to both Costello and Maureen this morning. Costello called first thing this morning.

“Maureen believes that because of the website www.MaureenRupeexposed.com (started by Costello, however he says Linda McKinney owns it now) that her name showed up on a porn site. She wants them to take down this website and they have refused. Maureen was told by a friend in Tampa that he say her name on a porn site. (he is an attorney and was investigating a case). She also said that family members have seen her name pop up on a porn site. She said she has copies of it.

“I searched Maureen’s names and there are pages and pages referencing her, but I did not find a porn site. Could be county computer would not bring that up.

“Costello was looking for direction from you going forward and Maureen wanted everyone to know that she cannot be in the same room with him.

“Direction?

“Marcia Newell

“Legislative Aide to Commissioner Robin Fisher

“Marcia.newell@brevardcounty.us”

Please note the line “Maureen believes that because of the website www.MaureenRupeExposed.com (started by Costello, however he says Linda McKinney owns it now) that her name showed up on a porn site.” That is a new allegation. Her previous allegations, that my website “has gone to many sites as a porn site” stated that my site was LINKED TO a porn site, which I knew to be untrue. For her to state that her name was ON a porn site (as opposed to “linked to”) is questionable, at best.

1. Is she alleging that it is just her name and is she the [only Maureen Rupe](#) on earth, or that the website MaureenRupeExposed.com is ON multiple porn sites?
2. Is she alleging that either Pete or I had anything at all to do with her name or my website *allegedly* being ON a porn site? (I have linked MaureenRupeExposed.com TO her [campaign website](#) [still up illegally] and she had nothing to do with that link.)
3. Marcia Newell writes that Maureen stated her “friend in Tampa say[s] that her name is on a porn site.” Is this the attorney who was looking at porn for a case, whose evidence has already been negated?
4. In Newell’s e-mail she writes that Maureen Rupe told her that “family members have seen her name pop up on a porn site.” Ignoring the fact that she just put on public record, via Marcia Newell’s e-mail, that her family looks at porn, let’s focus on the “She said she has copies of it.” I have asked Maureen Rupe to PROVE that she has copies of it and have yet to receive anything. IF I do receive anything besides the already discredited search engine result, I will forward it to all of you.

Tell me something. If you were webmaster of a porn site would you not be more careful with the links you post for your customers? After all, if you’re webmaster of a porn site and you link to any website that isn’t porn or porn related would you not be boring your customers and losing them for those “bad” links? If you’re interested in scrapbooking and you visit a scrapbooking website and the links there take you to the [Human Genome Project](#) or something about potatoes, would you stay at that website long? No. You go somewhere else. This is another consideration in weighing whether to believe Maureen Rupe’s allegations against MaureenRupeExposed.com, Pete Costello and myself.

Maureen Rupe’s resignation attack on Pete Costello was nothing more than an effort to get Pete kicked off of the PSJAB. Consider the facts:

- She resigns attacking him in her resignation letter but her alleged “proof” is against **me**.
- She says her family was “devastated” by something Pete Costello had allegedly done, but does not tell what it was he allegedly did.
- She says both she and her family were “devastated” by Pete Costello’s actions and that they were “not something that any decent person would do.” However, her “proof” was about porn and then she tells Marcia Newell that her “family members have seen her name pop up on a porn site”, too. So it’s bad for her name to *allegedly* be ON a porn site, but it’s okay for her family to surf porn sites? How “devastating” can it be for her to be mentioned on a porn site when her family apparently thinks it okay to look at porn?
- Pete Costello did start the PAC, Maureen Rupe Exposed and created the website for it. However, he let that lapse and it was registered by someone else soon thereafter, and now I own it. If Maureen Rupe has a problem with MaureenRupeExposed.com, she should

come to me and complain to me, not try to get Pete Costello kicked off of the PSJAB under vague, fallacious accusations.

- Maureen Rupe met with Pete Costello after either the April or May PSJAB meeting and ranted that Pete had to make ME take MaureenRupeExposed.com down. She didn't complain about him at the time. She tried to get him to control ME (which no one except my hubby is capable of doing).
- Maureen Rupe has not provided any substantiated proof of her vicious, fallacious allegations against MaureenRupeExposed.com, nor against Pete Costello. If she were actually so "devastated" would she not have some **non-discredited** proof? Has she provided anything to any of you?

Remember: Maureen Rupe's vague, vicious, fallacious attack against Pete Costello in her resignation letter was intended to get him kicked off the PSJAB. It almost worked. In an e-mail sent from his iPhone, May 7, 2015, Comm. Fisher wrote:

"From: Commissioner, D1
"Sent: Thursday, May 07, 2015 9:16 PM
"To: Newell, Marcia
"Subject: Fwd: Resignation

"Tall to her. When is his term up?"

"This message is sent from my iPhone. Please excuse any typos. 😊"

"When is **his** term up?" His first reaction was to find out when Pete Costello would be out of there. I have another question for all of you. If you get on Maureen Rupe's "bad side", when will she do the same to you? It's something to think about is it not?

If you have read this far, thank you for your time. I know it's a rather long e-mail, but it is the TRUTH.

Sincerely,
Linda McKinney
Owner/Editor/Webmaster
MaureenRupeExposed.com, PSJHistory.com, SpaceCoastConservative.com