

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 09/29/2021 10:41 AM

Council File No: 21-0878

Comments for Public Posting: FAUCI KNOWS THIS IS A KILLER JAB. VOTE NO - NO PASSPORTS, NO MANDATORY VACCINES, NO TO ANYTHING MANDATORY. This is from a whistleblower complaint to Fauci.
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fl1_rilqOyyUUrFllatiFh85DsoM4MpAM09dN7WhJC0/mobilebasic

Communication from Public

Name: Clare Bronowski
Date Submitted: 10/05/2021 06:39 AM
Council File No: 21-0878
Comments for Public Posting: Please see attached letter.

October 5, 2021

Direct Dial
310.282.6254
Direct Fax
310.785.3554

Email
cbronowski@glaserweil.com

VIA E-MAIL AND CITY CLERK PUBLIC COMMENT SUBMISSION
FORM

The Honorable Eric Garcetti
The Honorable Michael Feuer
Los Angeles City Council
Los Angeles City Hall
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Re: Council File No. 21-0878
City Council Agenda Item Number 2-October 6, 2021

Dear Mayor Garcetti, City Attorney Feuer, and City Councilmembers:

This letter is submitted on behalf of our client, Taubman Company, owner of the Beverly Center, to express our serious legal concerns about the proposed ordinance adding Article 10 to Chapter XX of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (Council File No. 21-0878) (the "Proposed Ordinance"). The Proposed Ordinance would require "Covered Locations," currently including indoor shopping centers and malls, to prohibit access to patrons without proof of COVID-19 vaccination or self-attestations of medical issues or religious beliefs, and require proof of recent negative COVID-19 tests for those who qualify for those exemptions. The Beverly Center, an iconic Los Angeles mall with over 100 stores and restaurants spanning eight stories, agrees that businesses must do their part to prevent the spread of COVID-19, and has already imposed strict protocols to keep its employees, tenants, and customers safe, as well as upgraded its ventilation system to ensure a safe shopping environment.

We fully appreciate the severity of the current COVID-19 crisis, and are prepared to continue to take meaningful steps to combat the spread of COVID-19, but this ordinance, as it is proposed to be applied to indoor shopping centers and malls, is unworkable, unfair, and threatens to unnecessarily hamper vital economic recovery without corresponding public health benefits. We respectfully request that you take a second look at these issues before enacting the current version of the Proposed Ordinance into law.

Specifically, we request that the ordinance be amended to eliminate indoor malls and shopping centers from the definition of "Covered Locations." The inclusion of indoor shopping centers and malls as "Entertainment and Recreation Venues" ignores

the practical operation of indoor shopping centers and malls that distinguish them from entertainment and recreational venues, making this grouping inappropriate. The City's Legislative Analyst Report dated September 23, 2021, relies upon a County Department of Public Health report dated August 24, 2021. The County report identifies multiple location types which represent a higher risk of COVID-19 transmission, including indoor entertainment venues where large groups of people gather for extended periods of time, often without significant distancing. However, these factors are not present at an indoor retail shopping center such as the Beverly Center. Specifically, indoor shopping centers are not subject to the "crowding" characteristic of sporting events and concert venues, which necessarily require individuals to congregate in close proximity to each other and commence and conclude at established times, resulting in spectators crowding at entrances and exits.

By contrast, upon entering a mall or shopping center masked patrons disperse towards stores of their choosing at times of their choosing. Further, indoor shopping centers and malls such as the Beverly Center are large, well-ventilated spaces where patrons are generally in transit. Accordingly, the City does not have a rational basis or scientific evidence for treating indoor shopping centers and malls as entertainment venues.

If shopping centers and malls are nonetheless classified (incorrectly) as entertainment venues, the Proposed Ordinance would need significant clarification because it is unclear how it could be applied to an establishment such as the Beverly Center as drafted. It is unclear, for example, whether the Proposed Ordinance would apply to the common areas of the Beverly Center at all times, the common areas of the Beverly Center only during special events, or to the common areas and to individual tenants operating at the Beverly Center. This ambiguity is especially problematic considering the hefty fines included in the Proposed Ordinance.

Assuming that the Proposed Ordinance were to apply to individual tenants within shopping centers and malls (as opposed to just the common areas), its treatment of indoor malls as Covered Locations is also irrational as it discriminates against malls and their tenants by failing to impose the same requirements on similarly situated (and in some cases identical) retail businesses that operate outside of malls. Retail stores that are not part of malls or shopping centers are completely excluded from the Proposed Ordinance's requirements, regardless of the size of the store or the products sold. Yet the *exact same stores* operating within malls may be subject to the vaccination verification requirement. For example, Sephora at the Beverly Center may be a Covered Location, while the standalone Sephora on a street in Los Angeles would not. There is absolutely no reason to believe, and no data showing, that retail stores within malls are any less safe than standalone retail stores, and therefore no valid public health reason for treating malls and their retailers differently than all other retailers throughout the City. There is no basis in science to treat malls and shopping centers differently than other classes of retail business, including big box retailers and department stores, which operate similarly and are not subject to the Proposed

October 5, 2021

Page 3

Ordinance; doing so here would impose requirements on indoor malls and shopping centers that cannot be reasonably implemented.

In addition to the unfair and unworkable scheme the Proposed Ordinance would create among City businesses, the Proposed Ordinance would impose anticompetitive and irrational distinctions between businesses located in the City and those within other cities or in the unincorporated Los Angeles County, which would not be subject to the Proposed Order. The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health's September 28, 2021 Order, titled Responding Together at Work and in the Community (effective October 7, 2021), will not require proof of vaccination to enter retail establishments, including malls, County-wide. City malls would therefore face the threat of losing business to neighboring malls in other jurisdictions with lesser restrictions.

We appreciate the enormity of the challenge the City faces in combatting COVID-19, and as stakeholders in the City and greater Los Angeles community we support the City's efforts to protect the community's health during these very trying times. Unfortunately, the Proposed Ordinance reflects an arbitrary approach that has no basis in data and would be inequitable and unworkable in practice. We urge you to modify the Proposed Ordinance to eliminate malls and shopping centers from the definition of Covered Locations.

Sincerely,

Clare Bronowski

CLARE BRONOWSKI
of GLASER WEIL FINK HOWARD AVCHEN & SHAPIRO LLP

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 10/05/2021 03:43 PM

Council File No: 21-0878

Comments for Public Posting: The passage of an ordinance to require vaccine passports to eat, shop and recreate indoors is a violation of your constituents' god-given rights under the US Constitution and the International law of the Nuremburg Codes. If you pass this ordinance, the Los Angeles City Council will reveal themselves to not be public servants of their constituents, but are blatantly establishing themselves as dictators, declaring themselves as medical experts without appropriate credentials and not really doing the research from real science, or understanding the US Constitution. In essence, the City Council is setting up Medical Apartheid with such an ordinance and will eventually open the door to further draconian restrictions on the residents of Los Angeles. The US Constitution protects and upholds the rights of its citizens. Businesses cannot legally ask for proof of vaccination. This is a violation of one's privacy and property rights as protected by State and Federal Laws. The 4th Amendment of the US Constitution states: "The right of the people, to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated." Title III of the US Civil Rights Act prohibits discrimination (medical issues) in private businesses, such as grocery stores, malls, banks, restaurants, retail stores, gyms and all public facilities including schools. This means it is illegal to require proof of vaccination as a condition for entry to any private or public establishment. Under the Nuremburg Codes, any effort to coerce, intimidate, persuade, trick or compel any one to receive any experimental gene therapy injection (COVID) or any other medical device, drug or procedure against one's will is considered a Crime Against Humanity. Please review the following : COVID-19 Vaccine Facts The only currently available COVID-19 vaccines (Janssen/Johnson& Johnson, Moderna, and Pfizer-BioNTech) are only authorized for use under the EUA Statute and have no general approval under federal law. Thus, the administration of such vaccines cannot be mandatory under the plain text of the EUA Statute. COMIRNATY, COVID-19 Vaccine, mRNA "are legally distinct" products. Moreover, the now "approved" COMIRNATY vaccine cannot be distributed for use until BioNTech submits "final container samples of the product in final containers together with protocols showing results of all applicable tests" and BioNTech

receives “a notification of release from the Director, Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER).” The following summarizes the current status of the Pfizer-BioNTech shots: All existing Pfizer vials (in the hundreds of millions), remain under the federal Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) (meaning people have the “option to accept or refuse”); The third or “booster” Pfizer shot is identical to the above and remains under the EUA with limited use to certain categories of people; BLA Approval Letter for COMIRNATY, COVID-19 Vaccine, mRNA (Aug. 23, 2021), <https://www.fda.gov/media/151710/download>. EUA Extension Letter for Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine (Aug. 23, 2021), <https://www.fda.gov/media/150386/download>. See EUA Extension Letter, *supra* note 4, at 2 n.8. 6 See BLA Approval Letter, *supra* note 3, at 2. BioNTech received FDA approval for people ages 16 and above under the name Comirnaty, but there are no Comirnaty doses available in the United States; In other words, there is currently NO FDA approved COVID-19 injection available anywhere in the United States. Every COVID shot in America remains under the EUA law and thus people have the “option to accept or refuse” them; and Even when an FDA approved COVID shot becomes available, individuals are protected by federal law and many states laws from being forced to get these shots based on their sincere religious beliefs or conscience rights. Thus, under the EUA Statute, administration of the currently available vaccines cannot be mandatory.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 10/05/2021 04:23 PM

Council File No: 21-0878

Comments for Public Posting: City Council, VOTE NO. You are not following science. You are following Karl Marx. This is America, not China or Russia. YOU swore to uphold the Constitution. WE Californians know what the vaccine is and what it does and what it does not do. It does NOT stop Covid. Period. See the Project Veritas film: Pfizer Scientist: 'Your Antibodies are Probably Better than the Vaccination' Nick Karl, Pfizer Scientist: "When somebody is naturally immune -- like they got COVID -- they probably have more antibodies against the virus...When you actually get the virus, you're going to start producing antibodies against multiple pieces of the virus...So, your antibodies are probably better at that point than the [COVID] vaccination." Chris Croce, Pfizer Senior Associate Scientist: "You're protected for longer" if you have natural COVID antibodies compared to the COVID vaccine. Croce: "I work for an evil corporation...Our organization is run on COVID money." Rahul Khandke, Pfizer Scientist: "If you have [COVID] antibodies built up, you should be able to prove that you have those built up." [NEW YORK – Oct. 4, 2021] Project Veritas released the fourth video in its COVID vaccine investigative series today which exposed three Pfizer officials saying that antibodies lead to equal, if not better, protection against the virus compared to the vaccine. Nick Karl, a scientist who is directly involved in the production of Pfizer's COVID vaccine, said that natural immunity is more effective than the very vaccine he works on, and Pfizer produces. "When somebody is naturally immune -- like they got COVID -- they probably have more antibodies against the virus...When you actually get the virus, you're going to start producing antibodies against multiple pieces of the virus...So, your antibodies are probably better at that point than the [COVID] vaccination," Karl said. Notwithstanding, Karl still believes that vaccine mandates are positive for society. "The city [of New York] needs like vax cards and everything. It's just about making it so inconvenient for unvaccinated people to the point where they're just like, 'F*ck it. I'll get it.' You know?" A second Pfizer official, Senior Associate Scientist, Chris Croce, corroborated Karl's assertion about COVID immunity derivative of antibodies: Veritas Journalist: "So, I am well-protected [with antibodies]?" Chris Croce, Pfizer Senior Associate Scientist: "Yeah." Veritas Journalist: "Like as much as the vaccine?" Croce:

“Probably more.” Veritas Journalist: “How so? Like, how much more?” Croce: “You're protected most likely for longer since there was a natural response.” Croce expressed dismay with his company's direction and moral compass: Veritas Journalist: “So, what happened to the monoclonal antibody treatments?” Croce: “[It got] pushed to the side.” Veritas Journalist: “Why?” Croce: “Money. It's disgusting.” ... Croce: “I still feel like I work for an evil corporation because it comes down to profits in the end. I mean, I'm there to help people, not to make millions and millions of dollars. So, I mean, that's the moral dilemma.” Veritas Journalist: “Isn't it billions and billions?” Croce: “I'm trying to be nice.” Veritas Journalist: “No, I hear you. I hear you. I do. I mean, I'll still give you a hard time about it.” Croce: “Basically, our organization is run on COVID money now.” The third Pfizer scientist, Rahul Khandke, admitted his company demands that its employees keep information from the public. “We're bred and taught to be like, ‘vaccine is safer than actually getting COVID.’ Honestly, we had to do so many seminars on this. You have no idea. Like, we have to sit there for hours and hours and listen to like -- be like, ‘you cannot talk about this in public,’” Khandke said. Khandke also signaled that proof of antibodies is on par with proof of vaccination. “If you have [COVID] antibodies built up, you should be able to prove that you have those built up,” he said. YOU will pay a heavy price if you go through with this mandate. IT IS NOT A LAW.

Communication from Public

Name: Cori

Date Submitted: 10/05/2021 04:57 PM

Council File No: 21-0878

Comments for Public Posting: This suggested legislation goes directly against the founding principles of our country. The United States of America was founded on the principle that every person's freedoms and rights were granted by our Creator. The Declaration of Independence states very clearly that "....all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness,--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed....". That section from our Declaration of Independence clearly puts personal freedom, liberty and the right to determine ones future as something that should be safeguarded and to take away an individual's right to decide what happens to their own body is to violate those very founding principles. Any laws made by any of our representatives should only be made if there are securing our rights that are bestowed upon us by our Creator. Laws that are created that work to deprive us of our rights should never be entertained, let alone passed into law. I urge every representative to vote against this clearly unconstitutional proposed law since it goes against the very principles for which our republic was founded upon.

Communication from Public

Name: Lynn

Date Submitted: 10/05/2021 05:53 PM

Council File No: 21-0878

Comments for Public Posting: I oppose the proposed vaccine passport mandate. The vaccines do not stop the transmission of the virus therefore there is no reason to discriminate against the unvaccinated. The passports will not stop the spread of the virus. Vaccination is personal medical decision that should not be coerced by city mandates that may affect employment. This mandate will hurt small businesses as it affects both employees and patrons.

Communication from Public

Name: TC

Date Submitted: 10/05/2021 08:37 PM

Council File No: 21-0878

Comments for Public Posting: I am appalled that the city council is even putting forth such a draconian, unconstitutional, immoral mandate. Who the hell do you think you are?? A vaccine passport is akin to Nazi Germany and Hitler. "Where are your papers?" Absurd to say the least. This is a very divisive thing. You are creating SECOND CLASS CITIZENS IN THE USA!!! This is definitely UNCONSTITUTIONAL!! Know that I will do everything in my power to stop this AND to convince others to do so also. I will DEFINITELY PERMANENTLY be voting against any city council person in the future who furthers this moral travesty!!! Communism and socialism have been proven to be faulty political, social, and economic ideas throughout history. This is America!! WE WILL NOT STAND FOR THIS BULLSHIT!!!!

Communication from Public

Name: David Anderson
Date Submitted: 10/05/2021 09:33 PM
Council File No: 21-0878

Comments for Public Posting: As a vaccinated person who owns and runs a business in LA, who avidly encourages others to get vaccinated, I am strongly opposed to this Order as written. I have objections on many fronts, but I will confine myself today to the most crucial: accountability. The biggest problem with this Order is a complete lack of a measurable definition for success. Project Management 101 says you must clearly define the goal in terms of measurable criteria. Measurable criteria allow us to: • Justify our actions • Motivate all affected people - especially those who are reluctant • Claim victory and return to normalcy when we achieve success If I learned anything earning a science degree from Cornell, it's that good science means precise measurement. So we must ask, what is the scientific goal of this Order? • Is it to get at least 80% of Angelenos fully vaccinated? 90%? 95% If so, by when? (For reference, as of today we have 69% of the county fully vaccinated) • Is our goal to maintain an available ICU capacity of at least 20% over a period of two weeks? 40% over 6 weeks? • Perhaps our health experts would agree we can downgrade this from pandemic emergency to endemic inconvenience when we reduce case counts below some specific number over some specific period of time? This Order vaguely references an intention to increase vaccination rates and protect the health and safety of residents by stemming the spread, but there are absolutely no metrics listed. How long will this order stay in effect? Shockingly, the word "until" doesn't even occur a single time in 10 pages. This order places a significant burden on businesses and individuals, but, as written, it is irresponsibly, even dangerously devoid of metrics or accountability. Why are these metrics so important? Here are just three crucial reasons: 1. Motivation. Whether you are energetically in support of this Order, on the fence, or opposed, having a clear goal helps get everyone on board. If the goal is 90% vaccination, we can name the goal Vaccine 90, and rally behind it. We can put Vaccine 90 on billboards, we can ask one another "will you help us reach Vaccine 90?", and when we hit the goal, we can celebrate together. And get back to normal. When the poor young minimum wage worker stuck at the door of a nail salon is engaged by an angry patron who doesn't want to comply, we can at least give her a fighting chance with the clear goal "it's only till we reach

Vaccine 90, then we can go back to normal.” 2. It creates accountability, which is fundamental to a just, representative government of a free people. Requiring ostensibly free residents to show their papers merely to enter a restaurant or gym feels to many of us like frightening government over-reach. Telling us that such overreach will end only at the whim of the Mayor - rather than in response to achievement of a measurable goal - further supports the theory that this is about power, not health & safety. If you want to convince the so-called “vaccine hesitant,” an Order without accountability will achieve the opposite of success. 3. Finally, it’s just good sense. NASA didn’t land Apollo 11 on the moon with the vague goal, “let’s go up.” The old phrase is trite because it’s true: Fail to plan, plan to fail. As written, this Order’s lack of plan means it must fail, and at great cost to many.

LA is proposing a ban on free travel similar to that enacted by NYC recently. It would require individuals to provide proof of their private health information (specifically, COVID-19 vaccine status) in order to enter everyday venues such as gyms, indoor restaurants, malls, and salons. This is a partial enumeration of the **reasons we should reject this order**.

- **Privacy.** First, let us presume there is clear science that points to this order being essentially required to prevent catastrophic public health consequences (more on that controversial notion later). Does the necessity of preventing non-vaccinated individuals from congregating justify an unprecedented breach of privacy on a broad scale? *Roe v. Wade* is predicated on a right to privacy found in the penumbra of three Constitutional amendments. On a broader scale, respect for the privacy of health status of individuals is enshrined in our culture as well as laws such as HIPAA. Have we truly exhausted all other means, and is the nature of this emergency (and its current trajectory) uniquely extreme and urgent enough to violate core notions of privacy? We lack compelling evidence to be able to say yes. However, if we do...
- **Lack of probable cause.** The Fourth Amendment guarantees the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects. It states clearly that if the government wants to see our private information, it must have probable cause. Orders such as this vaccine passport barrier presume guilt (lack of vaccine, ie authorization to enter) without probable cause. But if we disagree with this notion...
- **Inappropriate delegation to civilians for enforcement.** It is one thing to be required to show select private information, in specific cases, to duty bound officials of our government. These officials are presumed to be trained in privacy protection and duty bound to follow the letter of the law. It is quite another thing to require citizens to share private health information with a teenager at the door of a nail salon. Even if the substance of this order (that individuals must show proof of vaccination to enter a nail salon) is valid, outsourcing enforcement to thousands of unbonded, unvetted, untrained civilians is inappropriate. One may try to make a comparison to a bouncer at a bar. There are several reasons this comparison isn't valid. The most crucial distinction is that one's age is among the least private aspects of our private lives (and public knowledge within a reasonable range – which is why that bouncer doesn't card a 50yr old). Proving age is a far cry from revealing aspects our blood chemistry or other health information.
- **Racism.** Approximately 30% fewer Black residents of LA are vaccinated than White residents. Denying free travel to indoor restaurants, gyms, disproportionately to people of color is a racist and discriminatory policy.
- **Disingenuousness.** It's clear from the language of the Order that the desired policy of the Council is 100% vaccination of all residents. Moreover, the clear intended effect is to coerce those without the vaccine to attain it. However, the Order doesn't require this, it only penalizes those who choose otherwise. Rather than clearly state the policy of required vaccination, and write an Order that would enforce this, the City has attempted to hide their true policy aims in an Order that requires businesses to take the blame and brunt of nearly imminent backlash.
- **Business burden – cost and liability.** This order creates a significant burden on businesses with no compensation (but upon threat of significant fines). A small sit-down restaurant must now train one or more staff members in proper vetting of vaccine proof, as well as proper handling of sensitive information and conflict resolution (one can assume these interactions will inevitably lead to altercations, some turning violent). The business must also take on the liability of

properly managing the process, properly executing the verification (lest they be fined by the government), and dealing with fallout from imperfect implementation of this process, including putting their own employees at risk from disgruntled customers (see altercations above). Door bouncers are notoriously large individuals for a reason.

- **Business burden – labor.** This order creates a further significant burden on businesses, in a very tight labor market, by forcing them to invade their employees' privacy and ensure they are vaccinated. Headlines across the nation prove this will result in significant numbers of staff quitting, some who are vaccinated (but refuse to submit to the invasion of privacy).
- **Business burden – marketplace disruption.** The order creates yet a further burden on affected businesses, as they may no longer serve those who are not yet vaccinated, nor those who are fully vaccinated but unwilling to prove that fact to perfect strangers. The Order claims it is meant to "maintain the City's economic recovery," but may very well be the wrench in the works that stifles it.
- **Lack of measurable criteria or a precise goal.** This order crucially lacks measurable criteria for any facet. There is no measurable criteria for the justification of initial implementation (i.e., a specific number of cases or rate of rise in cases, or a specific ICU capacity, etc). There is no measurable criteria, or even a clear statement of, the precise goal of this order. Are we attempting to eradicate COVID-19 in the city of LA? Reduce case counts to a certain number? Reduce the death rate below a certain bar? Increase the vaccinated population percentage to a certain number? (which would also require proof that this denial of free travel to unvaccinated citizens would result in a meaningful increase in vaccination rates). The order lacks any clarity on this. All of which feeds into the big question, when will this end? A similar order in West Hollywood states that the order "shall continue until the earlier to occur of: (1) the conclusion of the local emergency; (2) its termination is ordered by the City Manager/Director of Emergency Services; or (3) it is duly terminated by the City Council." However, neither that order nor the proposed LA order define the "local emergency" in a measurable way, nor do they define what the criteria for confirming we have reached its "conclusion." In summary, this order contains no accountability to those who would enforce it.
- **Lack of specific scientific basis.** It's harder to make a precise argument on this front, because those supporting this order, and the order itself, do not present specific scientific findings to support the proposal. However, this lack of explanation alone disqualifies the order as being definitely based in science. Said another way, a scientific theory is a falsifiable statement made based on precisely measured data. This Order lacks a goal with precision that would allow the public to judge when it has succeeded, or that it has failed. It lacks scientific accountability.
- **Lack of scientific support for efficacy in methodology.** Most notably, clear science on human motivation shows that a "carrot" approach works better than a "stick" approach. This punitive approach (denying egress to certain types of popular businesses if one does not comply with the apparent policy preference that all citizens be vaccinated) flies in the face of decades of settled science.
- **Lack of motivation for enforcement or compliance.** "Flatten the curve," when the curve was numerically defined (at least X% of ICU capacity available), was a motivating goal. This Order lacks a goal that residents are asked to work toward, which would also serve as a much-needed aid for businesses and their workers who will inevitably clash with residents who disagree with being forced to prove their status upon entry. Again the Order defies science by asking a large

population to undergo inconvenience and conflict without a clear motivating principle, nor a clear measure of success.

- **Lack of clarity on scientific basis for efficacy of policy.** This order requires proof of vaccination, but will go in place alongside an existing order requiring all people, regardless of vaccination status, to wear masks at any place of business. What science are we basing this on? That the vaccine is efficacious and thus necessary for public safety? That the vaccine is only efficacious when coupled with masks?
- **Lack of consistent, scientific application.** It appears this order will not apply to grocery stores and some other places of business where large numbers of people congregate in relatively close proximity. The reasoning given in public statements is that these businesses are “essential.” There are many problems with this inconsistency. One is that the virus doesn’t know that a business is deemed essential. If it’s scientifically compelling that we should only allow vaccinated people into semi-large-capacity venues (like indoor restaurants), the science demands that we extend this to grocery stores, or we undermine the efficacy of the policy as a whole. There are many ways grocery stores can serve their clientele without them entering the store (Instacart, curbside delivery, etc). An exception like this strongly suggests that the order is not, in fact, based on science (or is done so in a deliberately inconsistent way).

This is just a partial listing of reasons this order is ill-considered, is unlikely to result in success (in fact, by definition it cannot, as it does not include or abide by a measurable definition of success), and places an undue burden on individual privacy rights, businesses, and employees.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 10/05/2021 10:17 PM

Council File No: 21-0878

Comments for Public Posting: File #21-0878. AGAINST. Please look up the word TYRANNY. That is what this council has become a systemically oppressive government. Before you vote, you owe us TRANSPARENCY. We would like to know: When does this end? Is this mandate forever? Who are the lobbyist? How much money/gifts/gratuities have you received to push this unconstitutional mandate? We demand TRANSPARENCY we need to see every phone call transcript, every email regarding covid anything. Are you accepting liability for those who will get sick from the vaccine? Are you accepting liability when private businesses get sued? Have you measured the economic impact on small business and residents? Councilman Price you recently opened a skate park at Trinity Rec center; I refuse to get vaccinated, my children will not be vaccinated the park is for the community are you banning us from this and all city facilities? Councilman Wesson what are the demographics in CD10? What is the percentage of unvaccinated Hispanic residents? What is the percentage of unvaccinated Black residents? Councilman Harris-Dawson what are the demographics in CD8? What is the percentage of unvaccinated Hispanic residents? What is the percentage of unvaccinated Black residents? Councilman Buscaino and Lee, please, please you seem to be the only members with some sense. The city is begging you please don't allow this to happen. Councilwoman Martinez this is a non-partisan issue STOP GASLIGHTING! The community has spoken WE DON'T WANT IT! Finally, I will say that I am prepared NOT TO comply. I will conduct all of my business outside of the city directly impacting small businesses. The science does not support this madness, if you are afraid of the virus stay home. Leave city employees alone we are tired of paying out lawsuits.

Communication from Public

Name: Joel Gompert

Date Submitted: 10/05/2021 10:46 PM

Council File No: 21-0878

Comments for Public Posting: I am vaccinated, and I don't want a society where I'm required to show papers to go everywhere, like some totalitarian regime. These requirements to show proof of vaccination do not affect only the unvaccinated, but impose upon us all. I would urge all vaccinated people to resist such requirements by refusing to show proof of vaccination, and not patronizing any establishment that requires it.

Communication from Public

Name: Michelle Ford

Date Submitted: 10/05/2021 11:41 PM

Council File No: 21-0878

Comments for Public Posting: Regarding: October 6th, 2021 Agenda Item Number 21-0878
ORDINANCE SECOND CONSIDERATION relative to adding Article 10 to Chapter XX of the Los Angeles Municipal Code to require proof of full vaccination with a COVID-19 vaccine to enter certain indoor public locations, large events, and City buildings. URGENCY CLAUSE – 12 VOTES REQUIRED ON SECOND READING Council may recess into closed session pursuant to Government Code section 54956.9(d)(2), (e)(3) (one potential case) Dear; GILBERT A. CEDILLO, First District NURY MARTINEZ, Sixth District PAUL KREKORIAN, Second District BOB BLUMENFIELD, Third District NITHYA RAMAN, Fourth District President Pro Tempore PAUL KORETZ Fifth District MITCH O'FARRELL, Thirteenth District MONICA RODRIGUEZ, Seventh District MARQUEECE HARRIS-DAWSON, Eighth District Assistant President Pro Tempore CURREN D. PRICE, JR., Ninth District MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS, Tenth District MIKE BONIN, Eleventh District JOHN S. LEE, Twelfth District KEVIN DE LEÓN, Fourteenth District JOE BUSCAINO, Fifteenth District Please take note that the California State Assembly, one of the 50 states of the Federation of States of The United States of America, is in session. Based upon the three international votes that have been taken, you are hereby noticed that you have no lawful authority over our American people. The three votes include: 1) All States are part of the Union of States. As of October 1, 2020, any emergency-based custodial interest by any foreign government in any of those States, is ended 2) "It is illegal to inject people with foreign DNA or RNA in this country, effective January 1, 2020 and the United States Provost Marshals, United States Marshals and Interpol, and the American Armed Forces including the United States Army and Air Force are authorized to intercept, arrest, try and incarcerate all corporations and contracting officials engaged in promoting injection campaigns and undisclosed unilateral contracting process against unwary Americans" 3) Our States have issued a joint Peace Treaty You are hereby noticed that our American people and our American State Citizens are not subject to any ordinance or mandate offered by you, your agents or your representatives. Let it be known to all, that any such ordinance or mandate is unlawful. The Authorization to Act,

message to the Joint Chiefs of Staff is attached as notice. Notice to Principals is Notice to Agents. Notice to Agents is Notice to Principals. So noticed, Michelle Ford - Recorder, The Los Angeles County Assembly Attached: Authorization to Act - Joint Chiefs of Staff Notice



Notice to Principals is Notice to Agents; Notice to Agents is Notice to Principals

Authorization to Act — Joint Chiefs of Staff

As we have often noted, this country is being used as a battleground for a perpetual Mercenary War based on False Legal Presumptions.

Those Presumptions have included the idea that our American Government is missing, in interregnum, absent, and that therefore, there is a custodial interest for the British Territorial United States Government and the Municipal United States Government, and more recently, the United Nations Organization.

Please note that our unincorporated Federation of States doing business as The United States of America is the government of this country in international and at the present time, global jurisdiction, as well.

Over the past five years, eligible Electors have been painstakingly identified and documented, and our Fifty State Assemblies have been called into Session.

These General Assemblies are able to function as Committees of the Whole and to take valid Roll Call Votes of eligible State Electors who are State Citizens, to resolve issues of international and global import.

Our Federation of States and our State Assemblies are the only entities with the standing to operate as the lawful American Government. All other efforts to reorganize have included District citizenry and fail to observe the legal and lawful requirements.

Three international votes have been taken.

The first vote was answered by those State Assemblies that were organized prior to the Civil War and resulted in the formal enrollment of all former Territorial States as States of the Union as of 1 October 2020. This formally ended any emergency-based custodial interest by any foreign government in those States.

The second vote established the first new Public Law in over a century, which forbids among other things, commercial claims against people who have received patented scraps of DNA or RNA, which, without disclosure, serve to provide an excuse to label these people "transhumans" and claim them as property owned by the patent-holders.

It is now formally and officially illegal to inject people with foreign DNA or RNA in this country, effective 1 January 2020, and the United States Provost Marshals, United States Marshals and Interpol and the American Armed Forces including the United States Army and Air Force are authorized to intercept, arrest, try, and incarcerate all corporations and corporation officials engaged in promoting injection campaigns and undisclosed unilateral contracting processes against unwary Americans.

The Third Vote which has been completed with 49 States in Agreement and 1 State Abstaining for lack of Quorum, has established a Peace Treaty formally ending the American Civil War which commenced in 1861 and which has continued as a perpetual emergency until 1 August 2021, when our States have issued a joint Peace Treaty formally ending the hostilities.

These actions on the part of the properly identified and organized American People are direct Presentations, not representations, to the other Principals and all incorporated instrumentalities exercising any of our delegated powers whatsoever.

Whereupon, the United States Provost Marshals, United States Marshals, Interpol, and appropriate units of the American Armed Forces, are requested and required to enforce the International and Public Law of this country and immediately act upon the International Arrest Warrants already issued and published, and to proceed with the apprehension of all corporation officials responsible for promotion of the Trans-Human Agenda.

These are commercial and international crimes against Humanity, amounting to genocide on paper, as these legal mechanisms seek to re-label and redefine living people as property assets belonging to corporations, deprive the victims of their established rights, and their property interests.

Those who have participated in this scheme include all the drug companies that have benefited themselves, all the research corporations that have similarly benefited, all the Governors who have continued to issue mandates and other proclamations in support of this scheme, all media companies that have allowed themselves to spread and enforce propaganda for profit and supported censorship in this country, and those other parties who upon further investigation have been involved in the deliberate and knowing and self-interested promotion of this agenda.

Please note that our American Government has been at peace since 1814 and this entire country is now at peacetime status. The peacetime flag should be flown at half-mast until 0800 on 12 September 2021 in remembrance of all those who have suffered and lost their lives for nothing but filthy lucre.

So said, so signed, and so sealed this 9th day of August 2021 in Big Lake, Alaska:

by: Anna Maria Riezinger

Anna Maria Riezinger, Fiduciary
The United States of America



Communication from Public

Name: Maggie

Date Submitted: 10/05/2021 01:24 PM

Council File No: 21-0878

Comments for Public Posting: Please OPPOSE the mandate regarding the mandatory vaccine in Los Angeles for entry into buildings. People who have had the Covid virus now have plenty of antibodies and don't need to take the risk of putting more of it in their system by having a shot. Many people are being cautious about having a vaccine that has not been fully tested (over a period of a year or so) and one that has had so many deaths and injuries due to it. This is America and this type of bullying is oppressive. Our founding fathers came to this land to get away from the tyranny of England. And here we are, again. Additionally, our restaurants and small businesses have suffered this past year and now trying to get back on their feet again. This mandate could make it happen again for them. That is totally unfair and cuts back their business and creates those who are waiting to get the vaccine 2nd class citizens. We are looking to you to do the right thing. Stand up for what is right and vote no. Thank you

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 10/05/2021 08:56 AM

Council File No: 21-0878

Comments for Public Posting: Vote NO on mandates. NO for any mandatory anything in Los Angeles. WE the people know what this Covid jab is.
<https://rumble.com/vlg7c7-dr.-brook-explains-the-hard-truth-to-ohio-school-board-about-the-mrna-shot.html>
Not only are YOU guilty of not upholding your oath to protect, serve and uphold the Constitution, you are now COMPLICIT in WAR CRIMES.