

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jessica Adams

**Date Submitted:** 10/01/2021 07:22 PM

**Council File No:** 21-0878

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear councilmembers: I am writing to oppose the adoption of the ordinance you are considering today September 29, 2021 to article 10 Chapter XX to require proof of COVID-19 vaccination at indoor public locations. This mandate is a violation of the United States Constitution. Do you know just how detrimental this mandate and the associated penalties will cripple the economy even more and destroy businesses that have barely made it this far through the pandemic? I implore you to consider less restrictive measures that other cities around the country have taken to reduce COVID-19 exposure; cities whose infection rates have never been as high as Los Angeles. Our city has experienced some of the toughest mandates in the country, and yet infection rates are still higher than almost every other city in the country. Something isn't working here. Further, discrimination against unvaccinated individuals makes zero sense since so many fully vaccinated individuals are still contracting the virus at alarmingly high rates. This is not the answer. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** A Los Feliz CA Constituent Opposing Vaccine Mandates

**Date Submitted:** 10/01/2021 08:58 PM

**Council File No:** 21-0878

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Councilmembers: I am writing to oppose the adoption of the ordinance you are considering, Council File #21-0878, that will require proof of COVID-19 vaccination at indoor public locations. The ramifications of this ordinance is a violation of the United States Constitution, The California Constitution and Te Unruh Civil Rights Act, California Civil Code 51 and the Nuremberg Code. Its associated penalties will cripple LA's economy drastically and negatively impact local businesses that are struggling due to the pandemic just as it is happening in NYC. I implore you to adapt less restrictive measures that other cities have employed that had proven to be successful. Our city has experienced some of the toughest mandates in the country, and yet infection rates are still higher than almost every other city in the country. Adding more stringent restrictions to a system that is already not working is not in the best interest of our city. Discrimination against, segregation and condemnation of nonvaccinated individuals is morally and ethically wrong. As publicly stated by Dr Valensky from the CDC, hundreds of thousands of fully vaccinated individuals are contracting the virus, which demonstrates that those who are nonvaccinated are of no risk to those who are vaccinated. Moreover recent trusted scientific data and studies from pioneer universal vaccine programs in countries like Israel shows that almost 65% of the critically ill patients with Covid flooding the ICU's in that country are fully vaccinated individuals proving vaccinated individuals are getting as critically sick as unvaccinated individuals. Please follow the latest science, this novel virus and pandemic is an evolving situation. Just today October 1st this scientific study has been published: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0146280621002267> CDC VAERS Database live count of Adverse Effects exceed as of today 1.5 Million verified adverse effects, please visit: <https://www.cdc.gov/vaccinesafety/ensuringsafety/monitoring/vaers/index.html> and <https://openvaers.com/> Enacting this punitive ordinance is absolutely reckless and not the answer. Let us find a more sustainable solution. Thank you. Respectfully, LS



## A Report on Myocarditis Adverse Events in the U.S. Vaccine Adverse Events Reporting System (VAERS) in Association with COVID-19 Injectable Biological Products

Jessica Rose PhD, MSc, BSc <sup>1</sup> , Peter A. McCullough MD, MPH <sup>1</sup>

[Show more](#)

Outline | Share Cite

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpcardiol.2021.101011>

[Get rights and content](#)

### Abstract

Following the global rollout and administration of the Pfizer Inc./BioNTech BNT162b2 and Moderna mRNA-1273 vaccines on December 17, 2020, in the United States, and of the Janssen Ad26.COV2.S product on April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2021, in an unprecedented manner, hundreds of thousands of individuals have reported adverse events (AEs) using the Vaccine Adverse Events Reports System (VAERS). We used VAERS data to examine cardiac AEs, primarily myocarditis, reported following injection of the first or second dose of the COVID-19 injectable products. Myocarditis rates reported in VAERS were significantly higher in youths between the ages of 13 to 23 ( $p < 0.0001$ ) with ~80% occurring in males. Within 8 weeks of the public offering of COVID-19 products to the 12-15-year-old age group, we found 19 times the expected number of myocarditis cases in the vaccination volunteers over background myocarditis rates for this age group. In addition, a 5-fold increase in myocarditis rate was observed subsequent to dose 2 as opposed to dose 1 in 15-year-old males. A total of 67% of all cases occurred with BNT162b2. Of the total myocarditis AE reports, 6 individuals died (1.1%) and of these, 2 were under 20 years of age - 1 was 13. These findings suggest a markedly higher risk for myocarditis subsequent to COVID-19 injectable product use than for other known vaccines, and this is well above known background rates for myocarditis. COVID-19 injectable products are novel and have a genetic, pathogenic mechanism of action causing uncontrolled expression of SARS-CoV-2 spike protein within human cells. When you combine this fact with the temporal relationship of AE occurrence and reporting, biological plausibility of cause and effect, and the fact that these data are internally and externally consistent with emerging sources of clinical data, it supports a conclusion that the COVID-19 biological products are deterministic for the myocarditis cases observed after injection.

### Keywords

SARS-CoV-2; COVID-19; myocarditis; VAERS; adverse events (AEs); COVID-19-Injection-Related Myocarditis (CIRM)

[Recommended articles](#)

[Citing articles \(0\)](#)

[View full text](#)



[Advertise](#)

[Contact and support](#)

[Terms and conditions](#)

[Privacy policy](#)

We use cookies to help provide and enhance our service and tailor content and ads. By continuing you agree to the **use of cookies**.  
Copyright © 2021 Elsevier B.V. or its licensors or contributors. ScienceDirect ® is a registered trademark of Elsevier B.V.  
ScienceDirect ® is a registered trademark of Elsevier B.V.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** SARAI CEDILLO

**Date Submitted:** 09/29/2021 08:42 PM

**Council File No:** 21-0878

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear councilmembers: I am writing to oppose the adoption of the ordinance you are considering today September 29, 2021 to article 10 Chapter XX to require proof of COVID-19 vaccination at indoor public locations. This mandate is a violation of the United States Constitution. Do you know just how detrimental this mandate and the associated penalties will cripple the economy even more and destroy businesses that have barely made it this far through the pandemic? I implore you to consider less restrictive measures that other cities around the country have taken to reduce COVID-19 exposure; cities whose infection rates have never been as high as Los Angeles. Our city has experienced some of the toughest mandates in the country, and yet infection rates are still higher than almost every other city in the country. Something isn't working here. Further, discrimination against unvaccinated individuals makes zero sense since so many fully vaccinated individuals are still contracting the virus at alarmingly high rates. This is not the answer. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/30/2021 11:56 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0878

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a tax paying, voting and hard working member of what I thought was a society, I do not agree nor endorse the city council views on forced vaccinations and associated mandates. These all represent obvious medical discrimination based on the belief that an unapproved, dangerous and definitely ineffective jab will protect me or anyone else for that matter. I know of multiple people who acquired the virus after the jab, and several people who died from one of the two. The people do not support your tyranny nor your disrespect for the citizenry of our city. Do the right and righteous thing and stop supporting these illegal, unconstitutional rules and mandates. If you choose not to heed these warnings.... The Nuremberg code won't forget your names.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/30/2021 02:18 PM

**Council File No:** 21-0878

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Council Members: I am writing to oppose the adoption of the ordinance you are considering today September 29, 2021 to article 10 Chapter XX to require proof of COVID-19 vaccination at indoor public locations. This mandate is a violation of the United States Constitution. Do you know just how detrimental this mandate and the associated penalties will cripple the economy even more and destroy businesses that have barely made it this far through the pandemic? I implore you to consider less restrictive measures that other cities around the country have taken to reduce COVID-19 exposure; cities whose infection rates have never been as high as Los Angeles. Our city has experienced some of the toughest mandates in the country, and yet infection rates are still higher than almost every other city in the country. Something isn't working here. Further, discrimination against unvaccinated individuals makes zero sense since so many fully vaccinated individuals are still contracting the virus at alarmingly high rates. This is not the answer.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Justin kase

**Date Submitted:** 10/01/2021 06:41 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0878

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear councilmembers: I am writing to oppose the adoption of the ordinance you are considering today September 29, 2021 to article 10 Chapter XX to require proof of COVID-19 vaccination at indoor public locations. This mandate is a violation of the United States Constitution. Do you know just how detrimental this mandate and the associated penalties will cripple the economy even more and destroy businesses that have barely made it this far through the pandemic? I implore you to consider less restrictive measures that other cities around the country have taken to reduce COVID-19 exposure; cities whose infection rates have never been as high as Los Angeles. Our city has experienced some of the toughest mandates in the country, and yet infection rates are still higher than almost every other city in the country. Something isn't working here. Further, discrimination against unvaccinated individuals makes zero sense since so many fully vaccinated individuals are still contracting the virus at alarmingly high rates. This is not the answer. Thank you



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Julie  
**Date Submitted:** 10/01/2021 06:43 AM  
**Council File No:** 21-0878

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Councilmembers: I am writing to oppose the adoption of the ordinance you are considering, Council File #21-0878, that will require proof of COVID-19 vaccination at indoor public locations. The ramifications of this ordinance is a violation of the United States Constitution. Its associated penalties will cripple LA's economy drastically and negatively impact local businesses that are struggling due to the pandemic. I implore you to adopt less restrictive measures that other cities have employed that has proven to be successful. Our city has experienced some of the toughest mandates in the country, and yet infection rates are still higher than almost every other city in the country. Adding more stringent restrictions to a system that is already not working is not in the best interest of our city. Discrimination against and condemnation of nonvaccinated individuals is morally and ethically wrong. Not only that, many fully vaccinated individuals are contracting the virus, which demonstrates that those who are nonvaccinated are of no risk to those who are vaccinated. Enacting this punitive ordinance is not the answer. Let us find a more sustainable solution. Thank you

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 10/01/2021 06:45 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0878

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Councilmembers: I am writing to oppose the adoption of the ordinance you are considering, Council File #21-0878, that will require proof of COVID-19 vaccination at indoor public locations. The ramifications of this ordinance is a violation of the United States Constitution. Its associated penalties will cripple LA's economy drastically and negatively impact local businesses that are struggling due to the pandemic. I implore you to adopt less restrictive measures that other cities have employed that has proven to be successful. Our city has experienced some of the toughest mandates in the country, and yet infection rates are still higher than almost every other city in the country. Adding more stringent restrictions to a system that is already not working is not in the best interest of our city. Discrimination against and condemnation of nonvaccinated individuals is morally and ethically wrong. Not only that, many fully vaccinated individuals are contracting the virus, which demonstrates that those who are nonvaccinated are of no risk to those who are vaccinated. Enacting this punitive ordinance is not the answer. Let us find a more sustainable solution. Thank you

## Communication from Public

**Name:** James BLUEMENTHAL

**Date Submitted:** 10/01/2021 08:12 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0878

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear councilmembers: I am writing to oppose the adoption of the ordinance you are considering today September 29, 2021 to article 10 Chapter XX to require proof of COVID-19 vaccination at indoor public locations. This mandate is a violation of the United States Constitution. Do you know just how detrimental this mandate and the associated penalties will cripple the economy even more and destroy businesses that have barely made it this far through the pandemic? I implore you to consider less restrictive measures that other cities around the country have taken to reduce COVID-19 exposure; cities whose infection rates have never been as high as Los Angeles. Our city has experienced some of the toughest mandates in the country, and yet infection rates are still higher than almost every other city in the country. Something isn't working here. Further, discrimination against unvaccinated individuals makes zero sense since so many fully vaccinated individuals are still contracting the virus at alarmingly high rates. This is not the answer. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Erica

**Date Submitted:** 10/01/2021 12:04 PM

**Council File No:** 21-0878

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am writing to urge you to VOTE NO for mandatory covid vaccination for the city of Los Angeles. We should not discriminate against those who are unwilling or unable to be vaccinated by preventing them from being able to enter indoor public spaces. Being vaccinated does not prevent the transmission of the virus, and only alleviates the symptoms for those who are infected with covid. For a variety of reasons, some are unable or have chosen not to be vaccinated. We must honor that choice and those individuals. Given the continually dropping rates of covid in the county and the high vaccination rate, covid is NO LONGER A PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERN. Mandating vaccination is a significant overstep in personal freedom for a very marginal return. Please allow us to move on with our lives and work toward a brighter future. Thank you for NOT voting to mandate vaccination in indoor spaces across the county. It is the compassionate decision for our residents and our community.  
Sincerely, Erica

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Bernardo

**Date Submitted:** 10/01/2021 02:10 PM

**Council File No:** 21-0878

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear councilmembers: I am writing to oppose the adoption of the ordinance you are considering today September 29, 2021 to article 10 Chapter XX to require proof of COVID-19 vaccination at indoor public locations. This mandate is a violation of the United States Constitution. Do you know just how detrimental this mandate and the associated penalties will cripple the economy even more and destroy businesses that have barely made it this far through the pandemic? I implore you to consider less restrictive measures that other cities around the country have taken to reduce COVID-19 exposure; cities whose infection rates have never been as high as Los Angeles. Our city has experienced some of the toughest mandates in the country, and yet infection rates are still higher than almost every other city in the country. Something isn't working here. Further, discrimination against unvaccinated individuals makes zero sense since so many fully vaccinated individuals are still contracting the virus at alarmingly high rates. This is not the answer. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Fredy

**Date Submitted:** 10/01/2021 02:10 PM

**Council File No:** 21-0878

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear councilmembers: I am writing to oppose the adoption of the ordinance you are considering today September 29, 2021 to article 10 Chapter XX to require proof of COVID-19 vaccination at indoor public locations. This mandate is a violation of the United States Constitution. Do you know just how detrimental this mandate and the associated penalties will cripple the economy even more and destroy businesses that have barely made it this far through the pandemic? I implore you to consider less restrictive measures that other cities around the country have taken to reduce COVID-19 exposure; cities whose infection rates have never been as high as Los Angeles. Our city has experienced some of the toughest mandates in the country, and yet infection rates are still higher than almost every other city in the country. Something isn't working here. Further, discrimination against unvaccinated individuals makes zero sense since so many fully vaccinated individuals are still contracting the virus at alarmingly high rates. This is not the answer. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Joel Slabo

**Date Submitted:** 10/01/2021 02:51 PM

**Council File No:** 21-0878

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear council members: I am writing to oppose the adoption of the ordinance you are considering today September 29, 2021 to article 10 Chapter XX to require proof of COVID-19 vaccination at indoor public locations. This mandate is a violation of the United States Constitution. Do you know just how detrimental this mandate and the associated penalties will cripple the economy even more and destroy businesses that have barely made it this far through the pandemic? I implore you to consider less restrictive measures that other cities around the country have taken to reduce COVID-19 exposure; cities whose infection rates have never been as high as Los Angeles. Our city has experienced some of the toughest mandates in the country, and yet infection rates are still higher than almost every other city in the country. Something isn't working here. Further, discrimination against unvaccinated individuals makes zero sense since so many fully vaccinated individuals are still contracting the virus at alarmingly high rates. This is not the answer. Thank you.