

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Emily Chancellor

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 01:48 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalising protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protestors have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sammy

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 01:50 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a Jew and an American citizen I feel less safe being unable to protest with my comrades. I'm a taxpaying resident of this county I have not caused or elicited any violence. We have earned our right to express ourselves and use the streets freely. The only people doing that are the people who don't like my message and beliefs. If they don't like it then they can just leave me and my friends alone. If you're really afraid of hate and violence you should spend time and money re-training and re-hiring your police force to de-escalate instead of creating excuses to take away our rights and ignore our suffering for the advantage of a select group of powerful people.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** L. Harrop

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 01:58 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around so-called sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First Amendments right to free speech is protect behavior practiced by union works and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Instead, I ask the city council to consider a process involving community stakeholders that protects protestors who have been harmed while engaging in their constitution-protected right to protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Adrian

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 02:01 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you



## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 02:02 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am horrified to hear that there is a meeting on a motion today to undermine our civil rights. To criminalize peaceful protests and gatherings against an ongoing genocide on defenseless people! It is shameful what we are becoming, moving towards a police state, putting so many restrictions on peaceful protests (a basic right!) where you cannot be within 100 ft of an organization or 8 ft from another person without their consent?! What happened to freedom of speech? Please do NOT pass this motion.

## **Communication from Public**

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 02:04 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** Protesting the flagrant attempt to undermine our civil rights !

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Melissa Hernandez

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 02:05 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** This motion to limit the county's free speech in response to protests against the sale of illegally settled land is outrageous. It is far overreaching and will have lasting damage on people's ability to organize for labor, school, religious organizations, etc. This is thoughtless and heavy handed and I hope my representatives decide to protect my right to organize publicly for my beliefs.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Xara Shaw

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 02:11 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I once again find myself disappointed in a city and a nation I love so dearly. I am disappointed that our city feels the need to use religious freedom and the plight of Jewish people as a shield against the voices of protesters who angrily are using their freedom of speech to condemn the heinous colonization of the Palestinian people. I am disappointed that we find ourselves constantly feeling the need to defend the "free speech" white supremacists, neo-nazis, and zionists (people whose ideology is based on harming the Jewish people). But as soon as that speech encompasses anger over the theft of Palestinian land, all of a sudden free speech doesn't really matter, and protecting Jewish people is a big concern. It is almost as if our leaders do not care about Jewish people, but instead, want us to shut up and go away. For facing the reality of the United States government's imperialism in the middle east and the reality of the war crimes being committed is just too much for their delicate little ears. The people here today pushing this policy will try to convince you that this is to "Prevent Anti-Semitic Terrorism". That the events at the Synagogue in Pico-Robertson on June 23rd were an instance of "Senseless violence against innocent people trying to worship in peace". In reality, the protests at the Synagogue had very valid reasons behind them. For behind the doors of that synagogue there was a sales pitch going on trying to convince wealthy Angelenos to buy property in the West Bank. Property on settlements that have been acquired by the Israeli government through the brutal violence committed against Palestinian people in the West Bank. Settlements on land that was stolen through war and as such is a war crime to settle Israeli civilians inside. The protests on that day were against war crimes and the wealthy Angelenos who were looking to benefit from those war crimes. Additionally the violence committed was largely by our own local terrorist organization, the Los Angeles Police Department, who escalated what at that point was a largely peaceful protest into chaos and violence. Beating protesters away with batons, shoving protesters out of the way, pepper spraying some in the face, and letting pro-Israel counter protesters run rampant. Letting them get into violent skirmishes, threatening Palestinian liberation protesters with a spiked flag, and allowing them to shout, "We have the bullets, you have the blood". A chilling statement that I think

perfectly encapsulates the brutal realities of Israeli occupation of the West Bank, LAPD's unchecked power of the the City of Los Angeles, and the broader imperialist control the American military industrial complex exerts over the world. For no matter how many people we have, how much blood of our we spill, how much we scream in our streets, our schools, our media, and our government buildings. They will still have the bullets. And as long as they have the bullets without any checks on their capacity to use them. They will keep using them to silence us. To ignore the screams, the bloodshed, and the abject squalor that they benefit from. Leaders of the Los Angeles City Council, you are not protecting Jewish people. You are not protecting the citizens of Los Angeles. You are not protecting religious liberty. You are giving the Los Angeles Police Department more tools to oppress the working class of Los Angeles. By banning protest in front of religious institutions, educational facilities, or public facilities. You are effectively banning not only Palestinian liberationists from protesting Illegal land sales. But also, teachers on strike from protesting their school boards. Public employees like janitors, bus drivers, clerks, garbage collectors, electricians would lose their right to protest at the public facilities that employ them. Nurses wouldn't be able to demand better conditions at the hospitals they work at. Students would not be able to demand the university they attend divest from genocidal entities. People would not be able to go to city hall and protest for safer streets. In effect you'd be stifling free speech and effective organization in Los Angeles for decades to come. You are giving LAPD more ways to easily justify the subjugation of the people of Los Angeles. You are giving LAPD more bullets to spill more blood. If this motion passes I will find myself once again, disappointed and disgusted with my city's leaders. Signed, Xara Shaw From the river to the sea Palestine will be free. Save South Central Queer rights are Human Rights LA is for people not capital

## **Communication from Public**

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 02:12 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I vehemently oppose this motion.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Phylis

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 02:33 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** What a sad situation to criminalize a constitutional right. I strongly want you to oppose criminalization of protesting.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Hope Stutzman

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 02:33 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** It is the basic right of citizens living in a democracy to demonstrate their beliefs and discontents with institutions through the practice of protest. It is harmful and anti-historical to limit that right. Fascism can be built through small steps like these, even if it's under the guise of liberalism.



## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 02:39 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Council Members, Do NOT criminalize protests in LA! The First Amendment protects free speech and the right to assemble and express one's views through protest. People have a right to protest and states have a duty to protect and facilitate this right. It's evident this protest ban is being pushed in response to pro-Palestinian support across the city, and is weaponizing antisemitism and public safety, though this motion will affect all manner of protests. This motion may be applied to labor organizers or workers picketing in front of their workplace. This motion also weaponizes efforts to protect abortion access to target protesters. We've already seen the suppression of protest exercised against community members here in LA following the overturning of Roe v Wade. Do NOT restrict or criminalize protests! The public has a a RIGHT to protest!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Hannah

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 02:41 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am writing today to ask the council to vote NO on Yaroslavsky and Blumenfield's motion to criminalize protests in public places. This motion not only threatens the people's critical right to protest, but it will also prevent public education and community outreach in essential places of gathering. In particular, criminalizing the display of signs and engagement in verbal education is absolutely absurd and authoritarian. It is important to consider all of the situations outside of protest that this motion will target. Handing out leaflets, displaying signs, and engaging in verbal education outside of our most common and accessible places of gathering such as churches, schools, libraries, and community centers are all essential methods of communicating with the public and our community. This motion will impede on organizations' and individuals' ability to engage in voter education, sexual education, health and safety education, and individuals' rights. Please vote no on this preposterous motion and protect your constituents' rights to protest and public outreach and education.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sameer

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 02:41 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** This is a violation of free speech and constitutional rights. It is a shallow attempt to silence opposing viewpoints and specifically affects pro-Palestinian protestors and reproductive rights activists. Stop abusing your position to put down the citizens that you disagree with.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** B. Hernandez

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 02:45 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose LA City Clerk Council File 24-0910 on the grounds that it obstructs free speech and undermines the principle of equal rights. This measure unfairly grants larger corporations, religious institutions, and educational institutions greater privileges than individual citizens, creating an imbalance in power and influence. Such a policy not only infringes on the constitutional right to free expression but also perpetuates injustice by prioritizing the interests of powerful entities over the voices of the people. All individuals, regardless of their affiliation or resources, deserve an equal opportunity to participate in civic discourse without undue interference or discrimination. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Mads Wade

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 02:45 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am writing today to ask the council to vote NO on Yaroslavsky and Blumenfield's motion to criminalize protests in public places. This motion is detrimental to our community and limits citizens essential right to free speech. Please vote no.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Shae Monyu

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 01:42 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am a Los Angeles-born resident very strongly opposing the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites (deemed "sensitive" by whom?) to criminalize the First Amendment right to protest. This motion brings forth a flagrant violation of our fundamental rights, infringing upon the free-speech rights of ANY form of protest whatsoever. This comes at a time when hotel and other labor workers are having to put their bodies and voices in the streets for pay that will keep them alive. We have already seen peaceful protests be antagonized, violated, and made violent by counter-protestors and LAPD alike. Further restricting the ability to protest would only create more violence by police and violent counter-protestors, or violence from counter-protestors and complete inaction or protection by police. Please do as you say. Listen to your constituents who want to freely exercise their bestowed rights. If this policy is implemented, all efforts toward equity and equality are squandered and unrest will only continue to grow. Anyone in a position of power to pretend this won't adversely and disproportionately affect communities of color in Los Angeles, which is majority POC, is behaving irresponsibly and unjustly. Please do right by all Angelenos and dismiss the motion.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Yetunde Olagbaju

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 01:43 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Adriana Medina  
**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 01:45 PM  
**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a life long resident of Los Angeles, I feel absolutely disappointed that this ordinance is even being considered as it jeopardizes our first amendment right. No institution should be put above public freedoms or opinions especially when these institutions are able benefit from tax-free breaks. Instead of promoting safety, this policy only sets to control and silence the voices of community members. Please reconsider holding LAPD accountable for their inaction in maintaining safety instead and vote NO on this ordinance



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Carmen

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 01:45 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protests. The first amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior puts community members at risk and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. At a time when we are still grappling with police brutality and racism in policing and settling millions of dollars worth of lawsuits using taxpayer funds due to our police forces injuring and killing protesters, we should be coming up with solutions to protect workers and community members, not criminalizing protesting. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protestors have been harmed while engaging in peaceful protest. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 01:21 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please do not pass this measure. This sets a dangerous precedent for First Amendment violations. As someone who has grown up in LA and seen how the city has changed over the years, measures like this do not make me feel any safer as a marginalized person (Jewish, LGBTQ, disabled). If anything, I would feel more afraid being in public if this kind of measure passed. Additionally, this feels hostile to a number of LA industries, where strikes + protests are often needed to ensure workplace protections. There's no way to enforce this kind of measure without social collateral damage, risk of increased racial profiling, and gradual erosion of our civil liberties. It's way too easy to misuse and abuse these kind of policies. Simply put, this feels a blueprint to making the city more dangerous for everyone to be in. Specific problems need to be addressed with specific and humane solutions, not with blanket permission to suppress free speech and right to protest.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ramsey

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 01:21 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** It is rich that the ADL, an organization that was allegedly formed to curtail discrimination, is now advocating for the city council to curtail our first amendment right to protest, all because they want to exterminate the Palestinian people in the name of the same supremacy that pushed to form their organization in the first place. Where I am from, we call that irony. The irony that protesting an end to a genocide is vital enough to get their racist supremacist lackeys in the city council to push for an infringement on our constitutional first amendment right in order to make their genocidal wishes come true, with minimal resistance. This is absolutely ludicrous and incredulous that the City Council would entertain such an offensive and disastrous resolution. This genocidal resolution will not only affect those who protest for an end to the genocide in Palestine, it will affect all Angelenos in their ability to stand up to all kinds of injustices just to appease the comfort of racist supremacists who want the annihilation an entire people. I would have never thought the allegedly "most liberal city in the country" would consider ways to curtail constitutional freedoms while entertaining some of the most racist supremacist organizations in the country defending one of the worst events in human history. States who have destroyed female bodily autonomy and LGBTQ rights are laughing right now, watching you consider a bill that would try to destroy our constitutional rights.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** M Hendry

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 01:21 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites due to concern over criminalizing protest. The First Amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and gives more power to an already corrupt policing system, which repeatedly has responded to peaceful and legal protest with unlawful brutality. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in their lawful right to protest. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 01:35 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protests. The First Amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harm's way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Micah Morse

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 12:19 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** "I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you"

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jane Zighelboim

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 12:27 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a Los Angeles resident, I condemn this motion and I hope those on the council will reject it. Protesting is a cornerstone to our democracy, and it's guaranteed by the first amendment. Also as a Jew, I am horrified that my faith is being used as a justification for this measure.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jane Zighelboim

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 12:30 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a Los Angeles resident, I condemn this motion and I hope those on the council will reject it. Protesting is a cornerstone to our democracy, and it's guaranteed by the first amendment. Also as a Jew, I am horrified that my faith is being used as a justification for this measure.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Julia Joyner

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 12:33 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly object to the motion to create bubble zones where protest is no longer protected as a constitutional right. This motion would jeopardize our right as Americans to free speech, and seeks to criminalize our moral obligation to our country. As a student protestor, I can not help but notice that this law would specifically target my peers as well as the workforce that I will soon enter. Additionally, by discriminating against protestors, this motion would protecting the people who enacted violence upon us by ensuring our voices are silenced. Furthermore, this motion raises concerns for union workers across Los Angeles. Protest is necessary when advocating for workers rights, human rights, and the future of our country. Protest is how democracy thrives. I ask you as an LA resident, a student, and a human being, please put the safety and voices of the community above the comfort of those who seek to oppress us.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** US citizen

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 12:34 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you...

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Abygail MingMei Michaud

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 12:43 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of the concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public community. This includes members of religion, students, and members of other communities. Criminalizing this behavior unnecessarily puts community members in harms way and takes away important focus from other law enforcement matters that should be prioritized. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in perfectly legal protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sascha

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 12:45 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am very concerned that instituting bubble zones around controversial sites undermines the very core idea of the First Amendment right to free speech. If a site is controversial, that is exactly what would be protested, and exactly what the First Amendment is designed to protect. This will contribute to suppression of protected behavior by union workers and other members of the public, and create more opportunities for clashes with police. There's no way this doesn't result in additional police presence meaning they will be seen as an even more antagonistic force than they already are, and will result in more potential for violence against the public. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address recent instances in which protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest, and in which the presence of the LAPD was completely useless. Thanks.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 12:47 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I understand that this law is meant to be a response to the Adas Torah Synagogue protest, which was a protest against the sale of stolen land in Palestine, and thus, a protest against ethnic cleansing. Does council disagree with protests against violations of the Geneva Convention? I understand there is a disagreement over conduct. My understanding is the counterprotestors were violating the peace of the protest, but I can accept the possibility that my bubble is biased. But even if that is the case, I've seen reporting on the incident that indicates that there was misconduct by the protestors and counterprotestors. Perhaps we can compromise on this moderate view. If that is the case, should the conclusion be, because of this conduct, that Angelenos can no longer protest against crimes and criminals? Gavin Newsom has railed against the "targeting of a house of worship." But it was not the worship that was being targeted, but the land theft. To Newsome and the bringers of this law, I would offer the same words that Martin Luther King cast against "the white moderate." I fear they are "more devoted to 'order' than to justice" and that they "[prefer] a negative peace which is the absence of tension to a positive peace which is the presence of justice." I'm sure, if the Ebenezer Baptist Church was holding a sale of stolen land, procured through intimidation, violence, and murder, that Dr. King would show up to protest. And, to be clear for those who struggle with hypotheticals and thought experiments, his presence there wouldn't be a protest against Christianity. Even leaving out the consequences this law would have on unions and the ability to conduct pickets, which would be egregious and would further exacerbate the rampant inequity in this city, this attempt to silence protest is a blatant act of fascism, and a milestone in the slide toward an American fascist state. I hold you responsible for stopping that slide. I hope you will do the right thing.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Brent Armendinger

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 12:43 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I write to state my strong opposition to this motion, which is an attack on the civil right to protest in public spaces.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Cindy

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 12:44 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jewish Federation Los Angeles - Joanna Mendelson

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 12:53 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** Attn: Public Safety Committee Members Jewish Federation Los Angeles writes in strong support of Item 11, 24-0910, to establish bubble zones around places of worship and health care clinics. JFEDLA supports balancing first amendment rights to protest, with the need to protect public safety and freedom of assembly and worship. As the leading organization supporting and representing hundreds of thousands of Jewish community members across LA, we are deeply concerned about the current climate, with an unprecedented rise in antisemitic incidents in recent years. The Jewish community's safety concerns have significantly increased. There is a need from our community for solutions that can offer protections and tools to safeguard Jewish institutions and synagogues and to respond to this moment. We therefore strongly urge your support in moving this motion forward from the Public Safety Committee for consideration by the full LA City Council. The passage of this motion can protect many diverse and vulnerable groups, including those trying to access healthcare and vaccine clinics, places of worship, and community/public facilities. Additionally, this motion can provide LAPD with clearer structure and guidance when responding to threats and groups that aim to intimidate or target these vulnerable sites. This motion is of particular importance to the LA Jewish community, which is experiencing record high levels of antisemitism. According to the ADL, in 2023, the LA Jewish community experienced 503 recorded incidents (up 112% from 237 incidents in 2022), including 326 incidents of harassment, and 159 incidents of vandalism of businesses, places of worship and schools. The recent large-scale violence targeting Adas Torah, a synagogue in the densely Jewish neighborhood of Pico-Robertson, has only reinforced this unfortunate reality and has heightened community fears and concerns. Given this climate, this motion to create "Bubble Zones" is particularly vital for the security of LA's Jewish community. We urge the Committee and City Council to move forward in establishing these critical Bubble Zones prior to the Jewish High Holy Days, which begin on October 2, 2024, with the Jewish New Year, Rosh Hashanah. High Holy Days are some of the largest gatherings of Jews in central places throughout the city, many of whom will be walking by foot, and are easily identifiable with traditional garments. We are looking to our Los



Angeles City leadership to take concrete steps that will ensure the safety and security of all communities. Angelenos, regardless of race, religion, ethnicity, nationality, or gender identification, should be protected from hate crimes, harassment, violence, and acts of vandalism, especially at sensitive sites where they worship, receive care, and exercise their personal rights. We thank you for your prompt attention to this matter, for your kind consideration, and for your commitment to the safety of all LA communities, including the Jewish community. Sincerely, Joanna Mendelson  
SVP, Community Engagement Initiative Jewish Federation Los Angeles

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 12:53 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protestors have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Dexter Calderbank

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 12:55 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** This is a blatant attempt to undermine our civil rights! We need to maintain the right to protest wherever is necessary to bring attention to issues of importance. To drastically limit the locations in which people can protest peacefully is to muzzle these socially responsible efforts.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** D Bergeron

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 12:57 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** This attempt to criminalize protest and undermine the very constitutional rights I once swore an oath to support and defend is utterly unconscionable. This is in direct opposition to American values. If the immorality of the proposed ordinance cannot be acknowledged, then surely you all must recognize that this will be a waste of City resources that WILL be wasted on the inevitable legal challenges. I implore you to vote "NO" on this one.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 12:58 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** Criminalizing and limiting the ability to protest is a grace hindrance on Angeleno civil rights and democracy. When a religious institution is selling land on illegally occupied land in a foreign country to warrants protest. This is a shame to see this coming up for consideration.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Colin

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 12:58 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** It is quite obvious to anyone capable of thought that the effort to instate “bubble zones” around every area worthy of protesting is a crude and shameless effort to shield the powerful in Los Angeles from the consequences of their vile, destructive actions and to foreclose any public discussion of the brutal genocidal campaign being waged by Israel with the explicit support of the American government, including the scummy losers on the la city council, who do not take a breath without imagining how it might affect the national political career they imagine for themselves, despite the fact that none of you will ever be ready for prime time. Even characters as unimaginative in their contempt for their constituents as you has to understand that eventually these kinds of efforts will unleash something far more profound and effective than the kinds of protests you’re so desperately trying to render out of bounds here.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Lynn "Jeong" Stransky

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 01:00 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** Protesting is one of the few ways we have to get our voices heard. To criminalize protest is an attack on free speech and decidedly un-American. We should be allowed to exercise our right to peaceful assembly! Outlawing protest, near any location, is an egregious violation of our Constitutional rights. The council members behind this bill can EAT SH\*T!!!!

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 01:05 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please don't pass this measure. It doesn't do anything to make my Jewish household feel safer. It only will limit people's rights to protest. For example, this would limit healthcare workers ability to strike against their workplace.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Michael Lopez  
**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 01:05 PM  
**Council File No:** 24-0910  
**Comments for Public Posting:** This is bad public policy that limits free speech and criminalizes dissent.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Justin Friedman

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 01:11 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a Jewish constituent of Bob Blumenfield I am disgusted by this brazen and cynical attempt to criminalize protest in our supposedly “liberal” city. The fact that our council is willing to spend our valuable time and money on these efforts shows that Blumenfield and Yaroslavsky place more value on running cover for an ongoing genocide in a foreign land than caring for the needs of Angelenos. It is worth bringing up that this horrific genocide being carried out by the Israeli government on the Palestinian people has been going on for decades and heavily escalated in the past year, with CONSERVATIVE estimates being over 300k murdered and starved Palestinians since Oct 7. Israel has turned Gaza into a war torn hellscape and dropped more ordinance on this tiny densely populated area than the US dropped on Nagasaki / Hiroshima or all of Europe in WWII. So it is completely reasonable for good natured angelenos (many of whom are Jewish) to see this horrifying massacre and want to speak out against it. Recently, there were peaceful protests at synagogues that made the depraved choice to host auctions of ethnically cleansed land in the West Bank! It is extremely cynical and dishonest for those who support the Zionist cause to portray these peaceful protests as antisemitic, because many of the people protesting these events were Jewish themselves and everyone protesting were speaking out against ethnic cleansing and genocide, not against the Jewish religion itself. The only violence at those protests was on the side of the police and Zionist counter protestors. It is so depraved for Blumenfield and Yaroslavsky to see these angelenos bravely speaking out against the most horrific genocide of our lifetimes and one of the most horrific genocides in modern history and cynically and undemocratically try to smother free speech efforts is downright sickening and these council members should be ashamed to claim to represent us. They should be ashamed to be attempting to stifle American citizens’ inalienable right to freedom of speech, one of the cornerstones of our constitution. This motion is so deeply immoral and reprehensible, it is a perfect reflection of Blumenfields and Yaroslavskys beliefs in Zionism and support for the Israel Holocaust of Palestinians. This motion is so harmful to so many angelenos who peacefully protest that the council members who present it and vote for it should be removed from

office for neglecting to fulfill their roles as representatives of their districts and constituents.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Catherine

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 01:11 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am strongly against the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites and public institutions because of concern over criminalizing protest. This ordinance would go against the first amendment right to free speech and peaceful protest. It will silence the voices of the Angelenos that make this city and county what it is. This will also likely lead to more of our community members being put in harms way because of increased policing at protest sites. This proposal goes against so many of the values of LA. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 01:12 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please oppose this draconian measure intended to strip LA residents of our right to protest at public facilities. Some of the facilities in question have been used by groups to promote racial segregation and the killing of refugee children with US taxpayer dollars. Human rights defenders should be protected, not forced out of view.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jeff Brenner

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 01:13 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I'm concerned that this measure will effectively criminalize protest

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Joan Williamson

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 01:13 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** To eliminate the public's right to protest does not make the city safer. As an American Jew, I implore City Council to REJECT Yaroslavsky and Blumenfield's attempts to criminalize protest in the name of safety. I want to live in a Los Angeles where the city's laws support the public's right to publicly stand up for what they believe in anywhere in the city, without limitation.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 01:14 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sights because of concerns that this will in effect criminalize protest.



## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 11:50 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate “bubble zones” around sensitive sites due to concern over criminalizing protest and further limiting first amendment rights. The first amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address inaction. Of LAPD in instances where protestors have been harmed while engaging in protests and civil disobedience.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** John Squire

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 11:50 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate "bubble zones" because of concerns about criminalizing protest. The first amendment is a crucial part of our democracy, and protest is protected as free speech. This ordinance will create easy excuses to prosecute people for expressing their first amendment rights just because they happen to be close to something in a densely built city.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Eleanor Whitmore Masterson

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 11:58 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** Our first amendment right of free speech and right to peacefully assemble and protest is under attack. We should be able to protest anything from a labor dispute to genocide and police brutality. This is a fundamental mechanism of our democracy. Shameful that LA county and city council is even considering this measure. I urge you to vote NO on this proposed ordinance. I am a registered voter in mid-city Los Angeles.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 12:01 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** This ordinance is unnecessary and a violation of first amendment rights, as it bars freedom of speech in the form of public protest. Criminalizing protest places increased pressure and danger on labor union workers, students, and other community members and activists.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sasha Ortiz

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 12:12 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protestors have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Elianne Melendez

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 12:19 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello, as a lifelong resident of LA and union member, I oppose this motion to instate bubble zones since this is a direct attempt at obstructing and further criminalizing all acts of protests. The right to free speech is protected behavior and should remain so. A motion like this would damage labor actions like strikes and picketing as well as other forms of protest. Criminalizing the right to protest puts community members, especially those of us who are people of color and working class and look it, into harm's way. Instead, any concerns over manners of protesting should be dealt with in a process involving community stakeholders that seek to address the inaction of the LAPD and LASD in situations where protestors have been harmed while engaging in protests and civil disobedience. Thanks, Elianne Melendez

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 11:45 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Rosalind Jones

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 11:45 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I implore this committee to vote no on proposed motion 24-0910. At its core, this motion is unconstitutional and violates the individual's first amendment right to freedom of speech, freedom to assemble, and freedom of protest. It is also clear that this is an extremely thinly veiled attempt to criminalize protest in general in LA city. This is comical and cowardly. To Yaroslavsky and Blumenfield, how can you claim to represent the people when you criminalize their ability to make their voices heard? You have made clear your allegiance to violent, special interest groups, but we, the dissenting people of Los Angeles, are prepared for this fight. The motion is in service of increasing policing's power in this city. The inclusion of parameters confining protest will demand the expansion of surveillance capabilities to monitor protesters. It will also embolden police with more codifications to justify their violent quashing of protests. This motion will prevent student groups from sharing information about campus resources, upcoming elections, registering to vote, how to get involved with their union or student government, among other things. It will essentially criminalize the community engagement and community building activities (both tactics that several Council Members and the current Mayor have personally utilized in order to gain their seats in city government) that are at the core of all community-based initiatives. Laws prohibiting protest are always selectively enforced, with Black communities historically bearing the brunt of this criminalization. This motion will produce the same racist outcomes that laws targeting dissent always have. To me it is useless to appeal to the moral compasses of Blumenfield and Yaroslovsky, since it is clear that they have none. So instead I make this promise to them and to this committee: protests are not going anywhere. No matter how much you try to suppress us, criminalize us and silence us, we will always rise again, stronger each time. You only demonstrate your own political cowardice by passing this motion. Vote no on 24-0910. Free Palestine.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** David

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 11:47 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** The purpose of this motion by pro-genocide councilmembers, Yaraslovsky and Blumenfield, is restrict and censor people who oppose Israel's genocide of Palestinians, so that the genocide can proceed more efficiently. This motion must be opposed by anyone with even a drop of human decency.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Emily Vecchi

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 11:48 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly oppose this extremely unconstitutional policy. We reserve the right to protest under the First Amendment!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Tariq Ra'ouf

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 10:14 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** This proposed law is unconstitutional, and would prevent people from using their rights of free speech. It's un-American, and it's designed by people who are terrified when the public have something to say about the direction corporations or governing bodies are going. This law is a shameful turn towards fascism and silencing people who have every right to be heard, and any city council member that votes for it shows how much they align with fascism rather than democracy.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Mary Lin

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 09:25 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 09:35 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Viviana Lopez Acosta

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 09:23 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** In-person comment at council chambers room 340 or submit written comment at [LACouncilComment.com](https://LACouncilComment.com) "I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Kimberly Higgins

**Date Submitted:** 09/09/2024 06:42 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I was just made aware of the intention to pass an ordinance that would criminalize protesting within 100 ft of particular structures (i.e. religious institutions, healthcare facilities...). As a downtown LA resident, I find this very concerning. Protest is one of our rights. If the protest is peaceful, it should not be restricted to any particular location. This sets a very dangerous precedent, and the potential to infringe upon our rights. It's extremely frustrating that instead of listening to concerns of protestors, the city wants to stop them from protesting all together. Please do NOT pass this ordinance. Maintain our right to protest!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jason Fernandez

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 10:09 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** This ordinance is a flagrant undermining of our first amendment rights. It's the kind of legislation one would expect of a fascist country attempting to silence its public. This cannot be made into law as it would completely deteriorate the strength of both unions and citizens fighting for everyday rights. I plead with our county legislature to not allow this to continue and side with reason.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Brittany

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 10:09 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First Amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior will severely impede the right to free speech in Los Angeles. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where peaceful protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Topher Hendricks

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 10:11 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** This ordinance is a violent dismemberment of the freedoms guaranteed by the first amendment. Any councilmembers supporting this blatantly anti-democratic measure should be considered traitors to the nation, and recognized on a similar level to anyone who attempted to overthrow the government on January 6th. The motives are blatant and transparent here, and any decent American will not stand for it. I will not address Bob and Katy by their titles or full names, because if they do not respect the foundational institutions of the United States, they do not respect me, and they in turn do not deserve respect themselves. Measures like this in other places are already facing lengthy and costly legal challenges, and in desperate times of need here in Los Angeles, it is unconscionable to waste taxpayer money and resources to commit further harm on our citizens. The right to free speech is THE #1 basic protected right we have as Americans, and any attempt to dismantle it should be laughed not only out of council, but out of office as well. The right wing does not have a monopoly on fascism; our eyes are on you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Abbey Barker

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 09:48 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you

# The Bill of Rights

---

## **Handout 3: Bill of Rights** **Ratified by the states on December 15, 1791**

### **Preamble**

Congress of the United States begun and held at the City of New-York, on Wednesday the fourth of March, one thousand seven hundred and eighty nine.

THE Conventions of a number of the States, having at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added: And as extending the ground of public confidence in the Government, will best ensure the beneficent ends of its institution.

RESOLVED by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, two thirds of both Houses concurring, that the following Articles be proposed to the Legislatures of the several States, as amendments to the Constitution of the United States, all, or any of which Articles, when ratified by three fourths of the said Legislatures, to be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the said Constitution; viz.

ARTICLES in addition to, and Amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America, proposed by Congress, and ratified by the Legislatures of the several States, pursuant to the fifth Article of the original Constitution.

### **Amendment I**

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

### **Amendment II**

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

### **Amendment III**

No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

### **Amendment IV**

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but

# The Bill of Rights

---

upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

## **Amendment V**

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

## **Amendment VI**

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.

## **Amendment VII**

In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

## **Amendment VIII**

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

## **Amendment IX**

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

## **Amendment X**

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Shane Young

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 09:48 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** This is a clear violation of first amendment rights that will most certainly be immediately challenged wasting tax payer dollars on yet another issue that is really a nonissue. The very right to assemble is gives people the power to push for change where it is most needed. Further, the right to assemble in the area where the message is most needed to be delivered is how our country ensures EVERY voice is able to be heard and not just those who can pay for power. The introduction of this unconstitutional ordinance is appalling, and those with the desire for its existence may want to finally open an ear to the viewpoint of those they are wishing to oppress. Your discomfort with truth shall not impede others rights. Quit trying to make LA into a city of ivory towers with rotting streets.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Aria  
**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 09:49 AM  
**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because I am concerned about the criminalization of protest. The First Amendment right to free speech is protected and is regularly practiced by union workers and members of the public. This includes the right to protest in any public location and outside any institution. Criminalizing protesting would put community members in harms way and present more opportunities for marginalized people to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process that includes community stakeholders and seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protestors have been harmed by counter-protesters while engaging in acts of civil disobedience.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Meg  
**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 09:51 AM  
**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First Amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Tessa Davis

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 09:56 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am opposed to this motion which seeks to criminalize our right to free speech outside of various public and private institutions. This law has an intentional chilling effect on free speech. It would significantly reduce the areas in which free speech can be exercised and it is not clear that the public can even practically comply (e.g. there are many healthcare, educational and other community facilities inside of large office buildings in the city and identifying and locating each is not practical but also not the obligation of a citizen exercising their constitutional rights). Regardless, it is the actual intent of this motion that seems wrong - to intentionally protect/restrict speech from reaching certain people/institutions. People protested the Catholic church when they were protecting of child abusers ... was this wrong? Should this have been illegal? People protest outside of abortion clinics. People might disagree on that issue but are we now saying that such protest is illegal? If that Jewish temple was selling land illegally taken from Palestinians - then people should protest against it. (And raises the question whether, if this motion passes, if such "protected" institutions should lose their "protected" status if they are taking actions outside their main religious/healthcare mandates... like selling land.) And free speech is most commonly targeted (and should be protected) against our government - so excluding public facilities seems especially fraught. This motion will be opposed and contested for violating our constitutional rights. It is unnecessary and is governmental pandering and overreach and I encourage our elected officials to protect the rights of all people to free speech.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Amy H.

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 09:57 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** To the council: What fascist reality are we heading toward if protest could be limited and criminalized in this way? How does retaliatory legislation that is meant to crush dissent, help your constituents? What special interest groups have you so deep in their pocket, the voices of the people can no longer be heard? Additionally, this ordinance could only lead to more escalation and violence from police. Consider the disturbing track record of corruption and abuse of power from LA's police departments. If this ordinance passes, you will lose the trust of the people you are supposed to serve.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Matthew Brush

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 10:01 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** This proposed motion is a direct violation of Los Angeles residents' right to peaceful protest. This type of bill will do nothing to protect businesses or local entities, and serves as a way to target unionized workers exercising their rights. This is a desperate ploy to stifle pro labor and pro Palestine speech in Los Angeles. As a public health expert I can definitively say that common sense legislation about guns and access to them would do more than this would. I urge the council to reconsider passing this restrictive and unnecessary motion.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Daniel Bitterman

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 11:13 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** Criminalizing the act of protesting is unconstitutional and inherently UN-AMERICAN!!! This country was literally FOUNDED on protest!! The claim that this is to protect Jewish citizens is absolutely false when Jewish people are getting attacked when they protest the actions of Israel! Jewish people don't want genocide done in their name and Amerocan citizens are furious that our tax dollars are fueling genocide when that's what we fought against in WW2 with the Nazis!! Are you a modern day, neo-Nazi?! Cause the Nazis didn't allow free speech!!! It is disgusting that ANY administration in the US, state or federal, would even CONSIDER limiting the FREE SPEECH of its citizens!!! It is appalling, abhorrent, and reprehensible! You should be ashamed if you had any part in introducing something to legislation in an attempt to silence our voices!! We will NOT be silent!! We will NOT go quietly!! And we will NOT let this stand!!! Best be wary, because there's more than just a Presidential race this year. If this council approves measures to hinder a citizen's right to free speech: firstly, you're just gonna get MORE protests, for sure. BIGGER and LOUDER than before; secondly, you absolutely WILL be voted out and replaced. The citizens of Los Angeles will have their voices heard, one way or another!!!

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 11:16 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites due to the concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech ensures that unions and the public may share their voice without fear of harm or criminalization. To encroach on this right puts our LA community at risk, particularly with run ins with the police. Please consider a process which includes community stakeholders to address the inaction of the LAPD in instances where protestors were harmed while protesting or engaging in civil disobedience. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 11:26 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the City Council, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed city ordinance 25-0910 that threatens to disrupt our constitutional rights to protest and free speech. The ability to voice our opinions and assemble peacefully is a fundamental aspect of our democracy, and any measure that undermines this right is deeply concerning. It is crucial that we are allowed to protest in public places and outside institutions where our voices can be seen and heard. Protests and public demonstrations are essential for fostering dialogue and bringing attention to important issues within our community. Limiting these rights diminishes our collective voice and undermines the principles upon which our nation was built. I urge you to reconsider this ordinance and prioritize the protection of our constitutional rights. Let us work together to ensure that all citizens have the opportunity to express their views freely and openly. Thank you for your attention to this critical matter.  
Sincerely, Marielle Hadid

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 11:27 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a constituent of the Hollywood area of LA and a union member, I oppose the creation of "bubble zones" where protests cannot occur. This is against the fundamental right to peacefully protest and will endanger labor unions when striking near their places of employment. Whatever concerns you may have about public safety, punishing peaceful protestors will not help.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 11:29 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** "I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience.



## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 11:34 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** Free speech/the ability to protest outside of government and other public places where people gather is a human right. How dare you!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jordan Barger

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 11:37 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the ordinance preventing protest within certain distance of specific places because it goes against the first amendment and the right to freedom of speech. This is a fascist motion that has no place in a country based on freedom and democracy. Please reconsider and do not pass this motion. Thank you for your time.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Naomi

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 10:17 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** Criminalizing protest, as this ordinance seeks to do, is so clearly fascist. If that doesn't make those being protested against, namely Zionists, recognize that they have indeed become fascists themselves, they are being intentionally ignorant. Protestors have rights, and we deserve to retain those rights. Nothing, not even this ordinance (if passed), will stop protest movements. You will simply be putting Freedom Fighters in jail. We will not stop. We will not allow fascism, in all of its flavors, to spread without a fight.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ruby Lanet

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 10:21 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** To eliminate the public's right to protest does not make the city safer. As an American Jew, I implore City Council to REJECT Yaroslavsky and Blumenfield's attempts to criminalize protest in the name of safety. I want to live in a Los Angeles where the city's laws support the public's right to publicly stand up for what they believe in anywhere in the city, without limitation.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Chelsea Moore

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 10:29 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am an IATSE union member and live in Los Angeles, I am horrified by Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Blumenfield's motion to create "bubble zones" around public buildings where protest will be illegal within 8 ft of pedestrians within a "bubble zone" 100 ft from public buildings. Peaceful protest is a First-Amendment right. This motion would infringe on one of our most essential civil liberties and limit our power to picket. Two weeks ago, the LA City Council approved \$44.1 million in police liability settlements. Now they're seeking to empower that same police force to unconstitutionally arrest activists and striking workers who are already risking their livelihood and safety to stand up for their beliefs. This motion is clearly an effort to silence voices of dissent in traditional public forums, and anyone in support of basic human rights will oppose it.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 10:32 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly oppose the motion to institute bubble zones around sensitive sites bc of concerns over criminalizing protest. protest is part of our first amendment right to free speech by union members and all the public. this is a reprehensible attempt to limit freedoms and puts lawful citizens at risk for dangerous run ins with violent police through their historic inaction have actually harmed lawful protestors and citizens - instead I suggest you work with the community to address the failures of the police to protect the citizens that are lawfully exercising their rights

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Annet

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 10:34 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** To constrict the public's right to protest does not make the city safer. I implore City Council to REJECT Yaroslavsky and Blumenfield's attempts to criminalize protest in the name of safety. I want to live in a Los Angeles where the city's laws support the public's right to publicly stand up for what they believe in anywhere in the city, without limitation.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sarah Cihak

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 10:36 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** Limiting the people's ability to protest in many public areas is a large step back from the progressive policies that Los Angeles as a city and as a county have been promoting throughout modern history. The right for people to speak their mind safely is one that is constitutional and placing limitations on our ability to peacefully gather for any cause should be frowned upon by all political parties. Instead of blaming protesters, why don't we redirect our tax dollars to more meaningful projects to negate the need to protest? Why don't we hold the police accountable for deputy gangs and unnecessary violence? Why don't we reinstate masking policies as covid wrecks havoc on our people every day? Why don't we reinvest the money into our community? One with the largest population of homeless folk in the nation. Why can't we use our taxes to continue funding education and meals and homes for the children here instead of sending money to corporations and elites who are destroying the world? If you want people to stop protesting, stop giving us reasons to protest. A bill like this won't stop anyone from feeling angry or hurt or betrayed by our own politicians. Remember us when your seat is up for re-election because the current VP is already afraid we will ruin her ability to win the election. If we aren't voting for her, we definitely won't be voting for any of you.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Maky Peters

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 10:37 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** On behalf of the more than 100,000 members of SEIU-UHW, thousands of whom live or work in the City of Los Angeles, we would like to express our concern with the proposal to enact a new buffer/bubble ordinance that would limit peaceful demonstration that does not interfere with the operations of a healthcare facility religious institution, educational facility, or community/public facility. Section 56.45 of Article 6.1 of Chapter V of the Municipal Code already creates a prohibition against intentional interference with the normal operations of a medical facility. (Section 52.45) This existing ordinance covers any hospital, medical clinic, medical office or other facility at which lawful, professional medical services, diagnoses and/or counseling are delivered to members of the public. The existing ordinance already covers conduct that interferes with the normal operations of the medical facility, and further restrictions near medical facilities could limit the ability of employees of the medical facility to exercise their right to free speech during a labor dispute. Further, we are concerned that the ongoing federal litigation regarding Colorado's buffer zone law means Los Angeles risks implementing an ordinance that is then immediately caught up in litigation. While Colorado's law was upheld in 2000, the majority opinion in the Dobbs decision signaled that the Supreme Court would be open to another challenge to the concept of bubble/buffer laws – particularly as pertaining to health care facilities. As of the writing of this letter, the Supreme Court is considering a petition for the Court to take up just such a challenge. (Coalition Life v. City of Carbondale, Illinois) Instead of leaping into a legally fraught fight, we recommend that the City Council begin by engaging a thoughtful community process that brings together stakeholders to understand how the existing ordinance has worked in the past and any incidents and concerns that have led to the proposal of this ordinance.

September 9, 2024

Councilmember Monica Rodriguez  
Chair, Public Safety Committee  
200 N Spring Street, Rm 455  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**Re: File 24-0910: Entrance Obstruction / Buffer Zone / Religious Institution Entrance / Persons Right to Protest – CONCERN**

On behalf of the more than 100,000 members of SEIU-UHW, thousands of whom live or work in the City of Los Angeles, we would like to express our concern with the proposal to enact a new buffer/bubble ordinance that would limit peaceful demonstration that does not interfere with the operations of a healthcare facility religious institution, educational facility, or community/public facility.

Section 56.45 of Article 6.1 of Chapter V of the Municipal Code already creates a prohibition against intentional interference with the normal operations of a medical facility. ([Section 52.45](#)) This existing ordinance covers any hospital, medical clinic, medical office or other facility at which lawful, professional medical services, diagnoses and/or counseling are delivered to members of the public.

The existing ordinance already covers conduct that interferes with the normal operations of the medical facility, and further restrictions near medical facilities could limit the ability of employees of the medical facility to exercise their right to free speech during a labor dispute.

Further, we are concerned that the ongoing federal litigation regarding Colorado's buffer zone law means Los Angeles risks implementing an ordinance that is then immediately caught up in litigation. While Colorado's law was upheld in 2000, the majority opinion in the *Dobbs* decision signaled that the Supreme Court would be open to another challenge to the concept of bubble/buffer laws – particularly as pertaining to health care facilities. As of the writing of this letter, the Supreme Court is considering a petition for the Court to take up just such a challenge. ([Coalition Life v. City of Carbondale, Illinois](#))

Instead of leaping into a legally fraught fight, we recommend that the City Council begin by engaging a thoughtful community process that brings together stakeholders to understand how the existing ordinance has worked in the past and any incidents and concerns that have led to the proposal of this ordinance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Gustavo Medina', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Gustavo Medina  
Political Director  
SEIU United Healthcare Workers West

cc: Councilmember Katy Yaroslavsky  
Councilmember Bob Blumenfield  
Councilmember John S. Lee  
Councilmember Traci Park  
Councilmember Curren D. Price, Jr.  
Councilmember Hugo Soto-Martinez  
Legislative Assistant Luigi Verano

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 10:44 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. I believe it is the duty of our elected officials to protect the rights of our citizens to assemble and have their voices heard, rather than suppressing the right to peaceful demonstration. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Julia Goldberg

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 10:50 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sites such as religious institutions, healthcare facilities, educational facilities, and community facilities because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harm's way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. As a Jewish community member in Los Angeles, this proposal would not ensure my safety nor my protection. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protestors have been harmed while exercising their First amendment right and engaging in civil disobedience.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Katherine Bingley

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 10:56 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concerns about criminalizing protest. The First Amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union members and members of the public. Criminalizing protests put community members in harms way and presents new opportunities for police abuse of power. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of the LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Protests need to protected, not criminalized. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Clarence J Brown III

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 10:58 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** This is a bad, unconstitutional ordinance. As Americans we are guaranteed the right to assemble, to air and seek redress of grievances. As Californians we have reaffirmed and protected these inalienable rights. Why, as Angelenos, should we abrogate and be forced to surrender them? That is what this ordinance does any way you slice it. There are already laws on the books that protect people and property from trespassing and assault. That is enough.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 11:05 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** Criminalizing protests undermines our civil rights. This is a blatant way to silence dissenting voices, particularly those who are anti-genocide. This is cruel and immoral.



## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 11:06 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** It is very disappointing to hear that our Council is considering a motion with "Persons Right to Protest" in the title that pushes for criminalization. L.A. is supposed to be a progressive city in a progressive state, so how is this motion even being considered in committee? I hope the Council is considering the way this could be used to target labor unions who picket and protest during labor disputes. If not, then the Council's ability to see the bigger picture is simply insufficient when it comes to deciding on legislation in the second biggest city in America. If this is about protecting the local Jewish community, then where was the Council when members of that community were targeted at peaceful protests by LAPD and counterprotestors? And is the Council aware of how much money the city keeps having to pay out on lawsuits regarding the LAPD injuring or killing community members? That is criminal behavior, yet this law would give Police even more permission to crack down on peaceful protesters exercising their right to assemble. The CO law after which this motion is fashioned has been challenged in court already, so L.A. and L.A. County know this law would be challenged as well, which means more taxpayer dollars would be wasted. My councilmember is Hugo Soto-Martinez, and if he votes YES on this, it will be hard for me to consider voting for him next time around. PLEASE do the right thing and vote NO.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Conner Good

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 11:08 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** To my City Council— As a proud union member, this ordinance is a slippery slope to legalizing strike breaking activities. As an American, it is a clear violation of the right to assemble peacefully. Issues that we care about as Californians are not just limited to the ones we protest at government buildings. Thanks to how complicated our lives are, those issues extend to the kinds of facilities featured as part of this ordinance. What are citizens supposed to do when no one stands up for them in regards to injustices with local healthcare facilities or schools? I worry that this ordinance could become just another brick in reducing what are supposed to be core inalienable rights afforded to all Americans. This ordinance is an unnecessary restriction of the people's right to speak. Please vote no. —Conner Good

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/07/2024 12:17 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** This proposed motion is ridiculously overbroad and represents a de facto ban of lawful union and first amendment activities such as picketing. Banning picketing of healthcare and educational institutions would unacceptably loosen the reigns on employers engaged in unethical and unlawful employment practices

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Zac Hug

**Date Submitted:** 09/09/2024 05:07 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** The very idea of protest is what this country is founded on. To criminalize it out of a misguided rush on behalf of lawmakers to act around ONE issue is madness. You will need protest yourselves in the future. It has helped YOUR causes. We will vote for, no kidding, ANYONE else if this passes. You are losing your base with insanity like this.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Wendy Renteria  
**Date Submitted:** 09/09/2024 07:31 PM  
**Council File No:** 24-0910  
**Comments for Public Posting:** This is a dangerous and unreasonable motion. This a blatant attempt to silence anyone speaking out against the genocide in Gaza. If passed, it would infringe our rights to peaceful assembly and impact laborers who conduct demonstrations for their worker rights. I urge you to reject this motion immediately.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/09/2024 07:46 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** Freedom of speech must be protected in a city as diverse as Los Angeles. A blanket statement prohibiting protests near institutions that are inherently political rips local Los Angelenos of their right and ability to voice their concerns. It also wrongly assumes all freedom of speech is dangerous or discriminatory if expressed near these institutions. What precedent does it set if you restrict freedom of speech around certain institutions? There is no limit to the extent the government, enforcement agencies, and these institutions can repress our right to free speech if this precedent is set.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/09/2024 08:07 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Audra Milosch

**Date Submitted:** 09/09/2024 08:12 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** Civil disobedience is not our problem. Our problem is civil obedience. Our problem is that people all over the world have obeyed the dictates of leaders...and millions have been killed because of this obedience...Our problem is that people are obedient all over the world in the face of poverty and starvation and stupidity, and war, and cruelty. Our problem is that people are obedient while the jails are full of petty thieves... and the grand thieves are running the country. That's our problem. Protest beyond the law is not a departure from democracy; it is absolutely essential to it. Furthermore, outbreaks of either civil disobedience or disorder are not the cause of our troubles but the result of them. They are the outcomes of YOUR slowness to address poverty, racism, and war. The political structure of this country, this state and this city are CLEARLY not adequate as they stand to remedy the ills of our society. Ordinary channels are enough to raise issues but often not to solve them. Protest, as demonstrated by movements as the Civil Rights and Vietnam is a fundamental part of the First Amendment and the political structure of this country that should not be limited or allowed to be manipulated by certain outside foreign entities the way you are proposing.



## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/09/2024 08:48 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Kelsey

**Date Submitted:** 09/09/2024 09:04 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** The prospect of criminalizing public protest is everything that goes against not only our city and county, but our country. I proudly protested outside of my mother's school during a teacher's strike, and the ordinance is being proposed that would've giving authorities the right to arrest her for practicing free speech? For letting the community know she isn't being paid adequately enough to support her family? Peaceful protest is a right that I should be able to exercise when my medical facility mistreats me because of my disability. It is a right written into the fiber of our constitution. I am a voter of the city and county of Los Angeles, and I am asking you to stop this unethical and unlawful ordinance in its tracks.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Cesar Hernandez

**Date Submitted:** 09/09/2024 09:15 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** The right to protest is free speech. Free speech is a first amendment right and will not be taken from the American people under any circumstances.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jalen

**Date Submitted:** 09/09/2024 10:25 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The first amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have unwarranted run-ins with police. I do not support this motion. Please consider this opposition as I am a community member of Los Angeles.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Graham Messadieh

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 09:04 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** To ban protest is the most cowardly action a government can take. It's a declaration that not only are the policies and rules enacted by their authority so unwelcome, unpopular, and unrepresentative of those they govern that people choose to take time out of their individual lives to come together and express their discontent, but also that the governing body is too fragile to tolerate criticism. This is embarrassing. This is short-sighted. This is weak. Above all, this is stupid. We will all do well to remember that protest is a compromise. It is an agreement between government and civilian: Freedom of expression in exchange for a promise of nonviolence. What happens when that deal is revoked? This isn't complicated. To use a quote the average liberal Angelino should respect, "Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable." Please keep those words in mind as you consider stomping out the peaceful option.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Theo Karon

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 09:06 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hey, this is a terrible idea, with consequences that will extend far beyond the intended application. Which itself is profoundly anti-democratic. Dissent is a valuable and necessary ingredient in healthy democracy, don't dampen it! Don't be fascist! Please!! - a Los Angeles Jew

## Communication from Public

**Name:** fae ari

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 09:06 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** This ordinance is in direct violation of the first amendment of the United States of America which allows the freedom of assembly. Criminalizing protests will not accomplish the goals that you believe it will. The people will not stand for this.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jonathan Zhin

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 09:07 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** To whom it may concern, I oppose this motion because the right to protest is a First Amendment right. Criminalizing protesting is a violation of the Constitution. The City of LA would also be complicit in genocide that has been occurring for nearly a year by silencing demands to withdraw financial support from Israel, with the latest atrocity now being the flattening of refugee camps with Bunker busters in Al-Mawasi. The City of LA would also be disrespecting the memory of Aysenur Ezgi Eygi, an American citizen who was killed by the IDF in Beita in the Occupied Palestinian Territories. Please reconsider this motion. Sincerely, a concerned citizen.



## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 09:08 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Elena

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 09:08 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Math

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 08:51 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly oppose the motion to create bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First Amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you for your time.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Greg C.

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 08:54 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest and infringing on First Amendment rights to free expression. The right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by the public as well as union workers. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harm's way and presents new opportunities to have unnecessary contact with police. Instead, please consider a process involving community stakeholders that will address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. You must take the side of democracy by refusing to instate authoritarian measures that contribute to a police state. Thank you!

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/09/2024 11:32 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** "I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank You"

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Azariah Southworth

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 12:01 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a resident in Downtown LA, I object to this overreach of government. This is an attempt to restrict free movement, including on public property. This will trigger a costly legal battle. Making taxpayers pay another outrageous bill we already cannot afford in this overpriced and unkept city. Get back to funding public schools, fixing roads and securing our future water supply. It's our right to gather and protest especially on public grounds.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sabeeha M

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 07:33 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** The right to protest is a fundamental American right. We must protect our right to speak out against injustice and speak truth to power.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 07:34 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose this motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The first amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of the LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ashly Medina

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 08:19 AM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Veronica Perez-Westbrook

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 08:16 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am absolutely appalled at the commitment to silencing the voices of the people via protest. We can not claim to be a free country if we criminalize protesting. This country would literally not exist without out; labor protections would not exist without it; civil rights would not exist with out it. What are we without peacefully critiquing organizations, the city, and beyond? How do ideas grow and expand and improve? How do cities grow and expand and improve with out critique; without protest? All we are telling future generations is they must remain silent, and that is not a legacy I want to leave behind. Do NOT pass this ordinance. It is atrocious, and is a slippery slope to fascism.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 08:28 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly oppose the new measure to criminalize protesting within a hundred feet of religious institutions, educational facilities, healthcare facilities, or public facilities as this wrongfully criminalizes our constitutional right to protest and puts unconstitutional barriers for protestors. It does not meaningfully improve the safety of the public, as peaceful protests are legal. We already have laws for if a protest becomes violent, and we should be protecting protestors from violent attacks by counter protestors etc. IT ALSO THREATENS UNIONS' RIGHTS TO PROTEST ESPECIALLY TEACHERS HEATHCARE WORKERS AND PUBLIC SERVANTS WHICH IS UNAMERICAN AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL. VOTE NO ON THIS MEASURE

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Katelyn Best

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 08:37 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am writing to ask that the city drop its outrageous plan to criminalize protests near certain institutions. This ordinance was a response to a protest against the an event advertising stolen land for sale in the West Bank that happened to be at a synagogue; it was not the fault of the protesters that the organizers and the leaders of the synagogue chose to use a religious institution to advance a violent colonialist project, and criminalizing protests merely because they happen near certain buildings, or involve events held within those buildings, is a clear violation of Angelenos' first amendment rights. I would like Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Blumenfield to think—really think!—about the collateral damage they would be doing in their ongoing attempt to silence dissent against the genocide in Palestine. I live across the street from Hamilton High School, where a couple years ago, students staged a walkout in protest of gun violence—something that would become a misdemeanor under the proposed ordinance. Nurses and teachers would be criminalized for striking outside of their workplaces. If a church was spreading homophobic or transphobic rhetoric, members of the LGBTQ+ community would be criminalized for protesting there. The bottom line is that this idea violates one of the foundational principles of a free and open society—people's right to gather and express themselves freely. This isn't about safety. If it was, you'd be just as concerned about the pro-Israel protesters who have assaulted pro-Palestinian protesters at multiple events across the city as you all are about the Pico-Robertson protest. Instead, it's a thinly veiled attempt to silence dissent against the American war machine's involvement in the wholesale slaughter of tens of thousands of children. You should be disgusted with yourselves.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Orion krause

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 08:45 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am very concerned over the new proposed restrictions over protest. Freedom of speech and the right to protest are an essential part of what our country claims to stand for, and protest is how people can advocate for themselves and others. Without the right to protest, people who need attention to be drawn to their needs or plight will suffer.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Cayli Cheeks

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 08:53 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** The 1st amendment gives us the right to freedom of assembly. Limiting the locations where people can assemble — particularly locations that are not privately held properties — is unconstitutional. There are so many issues in this city that need the direct attention of LA City Council (unhoused crisis, cost of living, LAX, calling for a ceasefire in Gaza, etc.) but you guys are actually spending time and energy trying to gerrymander where people can protest?? Please get a life and let the life be actually making your constituents' lives better.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Claire

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 09:44 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** This motion infringes on our right to protest and free speech. It comes from a false narrative that protestors are the aggressors. Most protests become violent when police and/or counter protestors become violent. Please vote this motion down.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Emma

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 09:46 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** This proposal is an egregious assault on the fundamental rights enshrined in the Bill of Rights. LA County and the City of LA are funded entirely by the public; your salaries and pensions are thanks to us. As such, you have an obligation to protect the rights of your constituents, rather than shamelessly violate them. Police Officers, on taxpayer dime, have used lethal force against students and community members peacefully exercising their first amendment right to freedom of speech and protest. Now, you seek to de facto abolish protest by hiding it from the public eye. You know perfectly well that by criminalizing protests in public areas and stealing one of our fundamental rights, you weaken its impact. This is cowardly, anti-democratic and disrespectful to the American servicemen and women who died in wars abroad so that we could enjoy freedom. In blatant disregard to their sacrifice, you are seeking to reinstate fascism at home. It is not only immoral but illegal to encroach upon the rights of the public. This ordinance is fundamentally anti-American, and the motivations of its proponents should be thoroughly investigated: why are they trying to silence Americans?



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Georges Elias

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 06:46 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** LOV3 Foundation Statement of Opposition to Ordinance 24-0910  
On behalf of the LOV3 Foundation, I vehemently oppose ordinance 24-0910, a deeply flawed and unconstitutional measure that threatens to erode the fundamental rights guaranteed by the First Amendment. This ordinance, which seeks to create “bubble zones” around sensitive sites such as religious institutions, healthcare facilities, and educational centers, is an affront to our democracy. It will not only criminalize peaceful protest but also disproportionately target marginalized communities, silencing voices that deserve to be heard.

**1. Direct Assault on the First Amendment**  
The proposed ordinance stands in direct opposition to the First Amendment, which guarantees the right to free speech, assembly, and protest. Let us be clear: protest is the heartbeat of democracy. The idea of limiting protests in the name of public safety fails to recognize that peaceful assembly is *\*already protected\** under the Constitution. The LOV3 Foundation stands *\*unequivocally\** against any attempt to limit these rights under the pretext of safety.

**2. Failed Precedents: Buffer Zones Ineffectiveness**  
History shows that buffer zone ordinances like the one being proposed are not only ineffective but also legally untenable. The following examples illustrate how similar measures have consistently failed:

- Colorado (Hill v. Colorado, 2000): Although upheld by the Supreme Court, Colorado's buffer zone law failed to prevent conflicts and proved nearly impossible to enforce.
- Massachusetts (McCullen v. Coakley, 2014): Massachusetts created a 35-foot buffer zone around abortion clinics, which was ultimately struck down by the Supreme Court as unconstitutional.
- Chicago, Illinois (2009): A law establishing an 8-foot buffer around healthcare facilities proved largely ineffective, with protesters finding ways to circumvent restrictions.
- Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (Brown v. City of Pittsburgh, 2009): A 15-foot buffer zone faced legal challenges, with parts of the ordinance ruled unconstitutional.
- Sacramento, California (2004): A 20-foot buffer zone failed to reduce confrontations, and enforcement was inconsistent. These precedents show that buffer zones fail in practice and face legal challenges. They result in costly litigation, public backlash, and do not provide the safety they claim to deliver.

**3. Criminalizing Protest is Criminalizing Democracy**  
LOV3 Foundation cannot

support any measure that criminalizes peaceful dissent. Protest is often the only platform available for marginalized communities to have their voices heard. Introducing criminal penalties for handing out leaflets, carrying signs, or speaking near a facility sets a dangerous precedent. This ordinance will disproportionately target union members, community advocates, and everyday citizens, exposing them to unnecessary police interactions and arrests?<sup>7†source?</sup><sup>9†source?</sup>.

4. Disproportionate Impact on Vulnerable Groups This ordinance would particularly harm marginalized communities who rely on protest to voice their concerns. Union members, activists, and community organizations would face heightened risks of detainment and criminal charges, even when engaging in nonviolent protest. This is not only unconstitutional but deeply unjust.

5. Alternative, Community-Centered Solutions Rather than passing punitive measures, the LOV3 Foundation urges the City Council to consider more inclusive and effective solutions. Engaging with community stakeholders, law enforcement, and protest leaders to develop guidelines that ensure safety while preserving constitutional rights is essential. A collaborative approach is the only way to protect public safety and uphold democratic principles.

Conclusion: A Stand for Democracy LOV3 Foundation \*adamantly opposes\* this ordinance, which would stifle the voice of the people, criminalize peaceful protest, and undermine the principles that ensure liberty and justice for all. As an organization rooted in Liberty, Optimism, Virtue, Empathy, Equality, and Equity, we call on the City Council to reject this dangerous measure. History shows that ordinances like these fail in practice and in the courts. They do not protect public safety; instead, they erode trust in public institutions, cause costly legal battles, and silence voices that seek justice. We demand that the City Council prioritize the rights of the people and reject this ordinance. We implore you, council members, to live our shared values and relegate this bizarre attempt at suppressing the voices of the people to the trash heap of LA history. Thank you for your time and consideration. Georges Elias Executive Director

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Michelle

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 06:58 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am against these ordinances that will criminalize protesting.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 07:18 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** First of all, this is going to impact all of LA county's 800,000 labor union members. Second of all, this is a blatant violation of our first amendment rights to freedom of speech. Our founding fathers are rolling in their graves. The freedom to express ourselves is a God-given right. Protests are what America was built on. They knew even then that the right to protest is imperative to our future and continued advancement as a nation. Otherwise how will we grow? How will we be able to respond to the needs of our people?

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 07:33 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First Amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior unnecessarily puts community members in harm's way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Mia Maldonado Bromberg

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 04:54 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly oppose this motion, because it will affect all manner of dissent: anti-police protests, reproductive justice, labor protests, and more. This motion could easily be applied to labor organizers or workers picketing in front of their workplace. There's a long and well documented history of LAPD violently brutalizing workers for this type of protest. The language is intentionally broad, including criminalizing "place[s] of public assemblage." This could apply to any location: parks, workplaces, city buildings. The motion can be easily weaponized against any form of dissent. The motion is in service of increasing policing's power in this city. The inclusion of parameters confining protest will demand the expansion of surveillance capabilities to monitor protesters. It will also embolden police with more codifications to justify their violently quashing dissent. Laws prohibiting protest are always selectively enforced, with Black communities historically bearing the brunt of this criminalization. This motion will produce the same racist outcomes that laws targeting dissent always have. This motion cynically weaponizes efforts to protect abortion access to target protesters. We've seen the suppression of protest exercised against community members here in LA following the overturning of Roe v Wade. Additionally, on the topic of abortion - This motion also would make educating the public about their abortion rights and locations where they can seek abortions in LA a misdemeanor, based on the language: "prohibit a person or persons from knowingly approaching another person within eight feet of such a facility without consent for the purpose of passing a leaflet or handbill, displaying a sign, engaging in protest, education or counseling in the public right-of-way within a 100-foot radius of an entrance to the types of locations listed above". As a community health worker and abortion doula this is something myself and my peers do on a regular basis, especially around warning people about predatory crisis pregnancy centers. This would essentially criminalize most community health communication which is a core element of public health promotion. This motion will prevent student groups from sharing information about campus resources, upcoming elections, registering to vote, how to get involved with their union or student government, among other things. It will essentially criminalize community engagement and community building

activities that are at the core of all university settings. Without the ability to share health information freely on campuses regarding substance use, sexual health, and psychological support services, this legislation will directly lead to worse mental and physical health outcomes during what the CDC has labeled a mental health crisis among U.S. youth. Criminalizing community engagement activities, such as voter registration initiatives and education around local and national elections, will decrease campus involvement and increase inequities that already exist around voter registration, access and use of community resources, and employment opportunities. This legislation prevents residents of Los Angeles from being informed and engaged in local politics and contributing to your re-election. It will also negatively impact enrollment at CA universities as many students will not apply to or enroll at a university where they know they will not be able to freely share and receive information and legally engage in the university community.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 04:55 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I don't wish for the right of protest to be violated. The first amendment guarantees this, and we are free to express our opinions. Curbing this right puts many communities in danger. Allowing this ordinance to pass will only further discourage individuals from expressing their opinions by threatening arrest.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Arturo Trejo

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 03:48 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** As Americans we have a duty, and responsibility to stand against injustices that defy our moralities. I urge to stop the genocide of the Palestinians who are under siege from a immoral, and brutal force from Israel, and a Zionist framework. We continue to witness a repression that has dehumanized a historical population, and land. Our protest is protected after the many fights communities seeking justice, and we will continue to protest until there is a Free Palestine, because when there is justice for Palestine, there is justice for everyone. It is our duty to advocate for justice, we are expected to protest if we do not agree with violence. As youth, students, parents, elders, workers, business owners, public figures, we have the right to obstruct injustices in policy, governmental edifices, school institutions, workplaces that benefit from violence against our moralities.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Claudio Bonoli

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 03:50 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 07:48 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Audrey Hwang

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 07:57 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 10:34 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed ordinance that would prohibit protests within 100 feet of certain institutions. This measure represents a serious infringement on the rights of peaceful assembly and free speech, both of which are fundamental pillars of our democracy. Designating specific areas for protests not only diminishes the impact of those demonstrations, but it also sets a dangerous precedent. By limiting where protests can take place, we effectively stifle the voices of the people. Many of the most pivotal moments in our nation's history—moments that have led to greater equality, justice, and progress—were driven by protests that were not regulated by the government but organized to push back against oppression and demand change. To impose restrictions on peaceful protests is to undermine the very essence of democracy. Protests are meant to challenge the status quo, and they often must be seen and heard in the places where they can have the most direct impact. Curbing this freedom will jeopardize the effectiveness of these protests and the important causes they represent. I urge you to reconsider this ordinance and recognize that protecting the right to peaceful protest is essential to preserving the freedoms that define this nation. Thank you for your time and attention to this critical issue.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Courtney Hanlon  
**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 05:33 PM  
**Council File No:** 24-0910  
**Comments for Public Posting:** Limiting protest or labor efforts in this way is directly contributing to facism. Think about this

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sus

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 05:36 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** It is our civil right to be able to protest. You cannot take this away from us.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 05:04 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** Los Angeles as I know it— is a city that has always represented a melting pot of different cultures and communities. The people who here know it and pride themselves on its inclusivity. While its people are wonderful— there's a lot of socioeconomic issues that require advocacy and community involvement. It would be incredibly disappointing for Los Angeles to ban protests (according to the conditions of council file 24-0910) because the democratic right to free speech—plus protesting, have been a key factor in giving the citizens of LA the ability to bring attention to dire circumstances faced everyday. Banning protests from being held within 100ft of schools, religious spaces, institutions, public/community spaces, etc. is denying protesters the ability to make themselves heard on the turfs that matter to the causes. It's obvious what this protest ban is a response to- but in the process of making this law happen: you are also ending the right of protest for many everyday corruption and injustices that are happening right here in LA. People are facing housing crisis, food insecurity, unfair wages and treatment, and more. Show LA that you actually care about it people.



## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 05:09 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** the proposed ordinance is an absurd violation of the 1st amendment, and of basic human decency. The loosely defined and wide variety of facilities/buildings included gives our government carte blanche to criminalize any form of protest/dissent, as well as any form of public life that can feasibly be portrayed as protest. there can be no doubt that this will be applied with disproportionate severity and force on the most oppressed and vulnerable members of our community.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 05:11 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** This measure blatantly violates the first amendment, and is clearly designed for viewpoint discrimination. The right to protest freely should not be encumbered-the council is beyond disingenuous in proposing these restrictions. They are not meant to keep anyone safe. These measures are meant to stifle the freedom of speech of Angelenos, with no true public safety aim. Again, the demonstration which occurred in protest of illegal land sales of occupied Palestinian land (which is being referenced as justification for this measure) was organized and attended by many Jewish Angelenos including JVP and If Not Now. These demonstrations were solely against the event being held which violated international law, and likely fair housing law as well. It is shameful that some city council members are trying very hard to twist the protest, and use it as a means to stifle free speech. The people are not stupid. It is as clear as day what is happening here, and no amount of suppression is going to make voicing opposition to genocide and the oppression of Palestinians, or any other peoples, stop.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 05:26 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** These motions and ordinances cannot be allowed to pass. It is a flagrant and direct attack on U.S. citizens' first amendment rights and putting these bureaucratic roadblocks in place to hamper the exercising of the right to protest is wholly unconstitutional. I denounce these decisions put forth by the city and am voicing my opposition to them.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 05:31 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of the concern over criminalizing protest. The first amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD instances where protestors have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Caden Healander

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 05:32 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** This motion is unconstitutional. Everyone has the right to free speech in the area they wish. Often times protesting in front of a 'public facility' is the only way Americans can get their voice heard or show support for a human rights infringement. This is censorship and incredibly scary as it is one of the warning signs of early fascism- limiting freedom of speech. In recent history, you can open your phone and see the news, protests have only gotten violent once counterprotestors escalate or there is police involvement. Protesting is a way to communicate peacefully and respectfully to institutions that an unjust event is occurring or that working class Americans are not getting paid a living wage. Please consider what side of history you would like to be on.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Seth Reid

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 03:43 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am deeply opposed to the motion to create "bubble zones" of restricted free speech anywhere in our city or county. It is horrifying to think that the government would be trying to limit the areas that citizens can exercise their right to assembly and freedom of speech. This is especially horrifying because these measures are being considered as a response to protests where people are demanding an end to US-backed land theft and US-funded genocide. In other words, hundreds (if not thousands) of Los Angeles residents have the moral courage to protest land theft in Palestine (including many Jewish Americans among the protesters like myself). As a result of this moral courage, motions like this are attempting to squash the righteous outrage of the citizens so that the status quo of human rights abuses can continue unabated. People MUST have the right to protest against horrific human rights abuses, no matter where those abuses are taking place. Limiting our freedom of speech does NOTHING to protect vulnerable groups, especially considering every vulnerable group is raising their voice against land theft and genocide in Palestine. Instead of attempting to crush the windpipes of the people speaking up for justice, maybe you should consider listening to those voices.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Nate Contreras

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 03:46 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** If this goes forward it will essentially allow an all out ban on our first amendment rights. Most of the public space in the entire city applies to the restrictions proposed in this filing. This is not just extremely concerning but barring on fascistic policy.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 02:16 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose this measure, which essentially serves to criminalize protests. We have the first amendment right to free speech, which is protected behavior practiced by union members and the public. Criminalizing this behavior put the public at risk and in even more danger of abuse by the police. This measure is unnecessary and deeply harmful to our city.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Candle

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 02:18 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** This motion attempts to undermine citizens' fundamental civil rights by severely limiting their free speech and right to protest. It blatantly misrepresents activism, which is a form of civil engagement central to American history and identity, as criminal activity. It is bad policy and sets a dangerous precedent. I urge the council members to protect first amendment rights by voting against this motion.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 03:57 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to establish bubble zones around sensitive sites. People have a right to freedom of speech, assembly, and petition protected by the First Amendment. Members of the public and union members have the right to practice this behavior, which, if criminalized, will put community members in danger through encounters with police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders to address the inaction of LAPD during instances of people being harmed while protesting.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Mohamed Bahardeen

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 03:57 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am writing to express my deep disgust with the motion that proposes the creation of buffer zones around religious institutions, healthcare facilities, and other public facilities. While ensuring access to these sites is important, this motion dangerously undermines our fundamental constitutional rights to free speech and assembly. The freedom to peacefully protest and engage with others in public spaces is enshrined in the First Amendment, and placing arbitrary restrictions on how and where people can express themselves within public areas strikes at the very heart of these freedoms. This proposal not only threatens our ability to advocate and share our views but also sets a troubling precedent for further encroachments on our rights. Limiting interactions within eight feet and imposing 100-foot buffer zones is a blatant attempt to stifle speech and control the public narrative, all under the guise of 'public safety.' If we allow this kind of suppression of our constitutional liberties, where does it end? I strongly urge you to reconsider this motion and seek a solution that truly balances public safety without infringing upon our essential rights as citizens.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 03:58 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I wholeheartedly and unequivocally oppose the proposed motion. It is wholly undemocratic and has dire racialized consequences the council has either overlooked or deems entirely unimportant. This will result in disproportionate arrests against Black and Brown Angelenos, allows LAPD to make more arbitrary arrests—namely of students and union organizers, who frequently protest outside of the very facilities they have regular access to as means to bring about change, and very clearly is a politicized attempt to quell certain types of political speech, as the motion even extends to "education" and flyering. This is absurd, and is obviously not an motion made in coordination with Los Angeles' most marginalized communities.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Taylor

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 04:04 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I fully condemn this attempt at getting around and erasure of basic constitutional rights and protections of all Americans require to have any semblance of responsiveness from the representatives chosen to guard their interests, who've decided money is more valuable than upholding and advancing our democratic republic , protecting citizens from abuse of power and corruption.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Matthew Salazar

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 04:05 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** "I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you"

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ari

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 04:07 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** Protest is a form of free speech. As a citizen of this country, I find it deeply concerning that there is a proposal to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites in order to criminalize protest. The First Amendment right to free speech is protected behavior in the country, and it is essential to a functioning democracy. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in lawful protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 02:50 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** It is our right to protest and it is protected under the first amendment. This motion will prevent student groups from sharing information about campus resources, upcoming elections, registering to vote, how to get involved with their union or student government, among other things. It will essentially criminalize community engagement and community building activities that are at the core of all university settings. Without the ability to share health information freely on campuses regarding substance use, sexual health, and psychological support services, this legislation will directly lead to worse mental and physical health outcomes during what the CDC has labeled a mental health crisis among U.S. youth. It also puts unions workers at risk if they were to go on strike and picket. Stop this madness and do not move forward with this motion. Angelenos have the right to protest genocide and the sale of occupied land.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ginger

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 02:51 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** This is a clear violation of our constitutional rights. Protesting has been one of the most crucial and effective ways to bring awareness to the injustices of the world. It has propelled America forward. Limiting the power of free speech will only hurt our society. Students have been on the right side of history in the past, and they continue to be beacons of truth. We should be proud of the sacrifices they are making to protect the lives of innocent people. Instead the government has allowed fellow citizens to attack and abuse them. I was at UCLA protests and saw with my own eyes the vitriol and violence being unleashed by pro-Israel mobs. We were peaceful and avoided confrontation. Their actions were not only permitted they were encouraged. The protest in front of the synagogue was also nonviolent. The allegations that they were blocking the entrance are false. The reality is that they were holding illegal real estate sales in an occupied territory. The highest court in the world has insisted that they remove themselves from the area. They just murdered an American citizen protesting in the West Bank, and our government will do nothing about it. Doctors returning from volunteering in Gaza say that they see children shot by snipers daily. Toddlers shot twice. That is not an accident. The ability to peacefully stand up for ourselves and others is a fundamental right and desperately needed to protect humanity.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 02:51 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalising protest. The first amendment right to free speech is protected behaviour practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalising this behaviour necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of the LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Anita Chowdhury

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 02:52 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** This motion serves to misrepresent protests against the sale of stolen Palestinian land (in violation of international law) as protests against a synagogue as well as to erase the violence enacted on pro Palestinian protestors at UCLA, whom at both events the police did not deign to protect. This motion also serves to weaponize progressive language in support of reproductive rights in an effort to quash all manner of dissent, including for the expanding of reproductive rights. This motion aims to destroy all signs of life in Los Angeles, tactics borrowed from the 41.18 policy that aims to annihilate the unhoused, at a rate of 6 a day. this motion is Yaroslavsky and Blumenfield asking for more blood spilled as they sicc LAPD on any person at a public facility for any unclear reason as “approaching with intent to educate”, an LAPD that we have known to use laws such as these to brutalize black bodies. This motion is a culmination of the fascistic desires fostered by city council in Yaroslavsky and Blumenfield, do not permit their violence. Vote no and stand with the Angelenos who have already been brutalized at the hands of policymakers like Yarosklavsky and Blumenfield, who cannot, will not, and don’t want to keep us safe.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gladys

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 02:56 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please do not be the people who go down in history as limiting the rights of free speech. Any democracy requires accountability wherever it may come from. So many historic wins in LA civil and human rights have come from protest. The people will never stop protesting, but YOU can protect your constituents from criminal charges that limit their ability to be full humans in this country.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Kira Bunker

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 02:59 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First Ammendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior puts community members in harms way. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that addresses the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in their First Ammendment right.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Tim O'Neill

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 03:01 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First Amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior unnecessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protestors have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. I echo the messaging by Jewish Voice of Peace in Los Angeles that states to Vote No on public funds going to zionist private security. This motion takes money away from public services like housing, education, and healthcare that promote the wellbeing of our community. This motion comes in light of a real estate event being held at a synagogue on June 23, 2024. Land theft, occupation, apartheid, and genocide are not Jewish values. "We are anti-zionists because we want a world in which Palestinians, Jews and all people are safe and free." Don't choose the side of fear, hate, and supremacy. VOTE NO.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 03:01 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protestors have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 03:03 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior necessarily puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.



## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 03:04 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I urge all of you to NOT let this pass. By criminalizing protests of any scale, this will further erode citizens' First Amendment right to free speech. This also relates to union strikes will be a lot more difficult to organize when this pass, especially when right now some if not most of them are on strike in demand for better working conditions, this will ONLY benefit the rich in the long term, and eventually will lead to an economic collapse due to potential criminalization of picket lines, and current persistent lacking in providing all workers the protections, benefits and better wages that they deserve to thrive with. The resources meant for this policy should be better used elsewhere than trying to disrupt people's right to free speech.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 03:09 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First Amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities for run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protesters have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 03:11 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** I oppose the motion to instate bubble zones around sensitive sites because of concern over criminalizing protest. The First amendment right to free speech is protected behavior practiced by union workers and members of the public. Criminalizing this behavior puts community members in harms way and presents new opportunities to have run-ins with the police. Please instead consider a process involving community stakeholders that seeks to address the inaction of LAPD in instances where protestors have been harmed while engaging in protest and civil disobedience. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Josh

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 03:20 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** On Tuesday 9/10, LA City Council's Public Safety Committee will be voting on a new motion by Katy Yaroslavsky and Bob Blumenfield seeking to broadly criminalize protest. This is just the most recent effort by Yaroslavsky and Blumenfield to suppress pro-Palestinian dissent. This motion partly stems from the city's attempts to misrepresent protests against the sale of stolen Palestinian land (in violation of international law) as protests against a synagogue, which is ironic given that using the synagogue to sell land is in itself in violation of Jewish religious law. These councilmembers are pushing this protest ban in response to pro-Palestinian support across the city, but this motion will affect all manner of dissent: anti-police protests, reproductive justice, labor protests, and more. This motion could easily be applied to labor organizers or workers picketing in front of their workplace. There's a long and well documented history of LAPD violently brutalizing workers for this type of protest, and outright criminalization of protest in these locations is stepping on the threshold of autocracy. The language is intentionally broad, including criminalizing "place[s] of public assemblage." This could apply to any location: parks, workplaces, city buildings. The motion can be easily weaponized against any form of dissent. The motion is in service of increasing policing's power in this city. The inclusion of parameters confining protest will demand the expansion of surveillance capabilities to monitor protesters. It will also embolden police with more codifications to justify their violently quashing dissent. Laws prohibiting protest are always selectively enforced, with Black communities historically bearing the brunt of this criminalization. This motion will produce the same racist outcomes that laws targeting dissent always have. This motion cynically weaponizes efforts to protect abortion access to target protesters. We've seen the suppression of protest exercised against community members here in LA following the overturning of Roe v Wade. Additionally, on the topic of abortion - This motion also would make educating the public about their abortion rights and locations where they can seek abortions in LA a misdemeanor, based on the language: "prohibit a person or persons from knowingly approaching another person within eight feet of such a facility without consent for the purpose of passing a leaflet or handbill, displaying a sign, engaging in protest,

education or counseling in the public right-of-way within a 100-foot radius of an entrance to the types of locations listed above”. As a sibling of a community health worker and abortion doula this is something my family and peers do on a regular basis, especially around warning people about predatory crisis pregnancy centers. This would essentially criminalize most community health communication which is a core element of public health promotion. This motion will prevent student groups from sharing information about campus resources, upcoming elections, registering to vote, how to get involved with their union or student government, among other things. It will essentially criminalize community engagement and community building activities that are at the core of all university settings. Without the ability to share health information freely on campuses regarding substance use, sexual health, and psychological support services, this legislation will directly lead to worse mental and physical health outcomes during what the CDC has labeled a mental health crisis among U.S. youth. Criminalizing community engagement activities, such as voter registration initiatives and education around local and national elections, will decrease campus involvement and increase inequities that already exist around voter registration, access and use of community resources, and employment opportunities. This legislation prevents residents of Los Angeles from being informed and engaged in local politics and contributing to your re-election. It will also negatively impact enrollment at CA universities as many students will not apply to or enroll at a university where they know they will not be able to freely share and receive information and legally engage in the university community.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Beña Pat-Loeza

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 03:22 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** Re: Council File Number 24-0910 To the Los Angeles City Council, I am vehemently against this motion and will not accept the premise that this motion is meant to keep the public's safety in mind. My past record as a Los Angeles resident when I was young and US Marine would show that I was an administrator by trade and training, and a security expert by experience having lived in South Central on 33rd and Central during riots in my youth in Watts, and having served in Helmand Province, in Afghanistan in the 2010's. There are already ordinances in place to keep all public spaces safe from obstruction, detainment, hindrance, etc. There's a claim being made that is disconnected from actual real life that. I do not see a request being made to support the entire city of Los Angeles and it's residents, I see the entire picture and it doesn't revolve around any sensitive individual, organization, religious/political sect, or communities. Here's the disconnect; law enforcement is not meant to be a body guard and they aren't meant to use judgement based on one perspective's biased judgement, they already have their own biases that they "train" to avoid relying on. Giving them a broader scope aimed at taking away anyone's right to freedom of speech, of which protest is protected, the right I went to Afghanistan to protect, does not keep public safety in mind when the fact is there is no violence that comes from peaceful protestors. If the city council does not visit these peaceful protest sites to communicate and relies only on second hand accounts from folks that wish to eliminate free speech as protected under the US Constitution, then it is easy to see that this entire motion needs to take a back seat and/or be removed in order to focus on more important security risks posed by radical anti-Muslim attitudes, anti-black and anti-brown attitudes, or the even the LASD's attitude on removing the organized gangs within their department. Law enforcement needs less resources until they eliminate gang members, charge them for the crimes they commit and investigate themselves and not broader language to restrict freedom of speech, protesting as protected by the US constitution. We know what this ordinance means and we are completely against it. I speak for all LA residents that wish to maintain their freedom of speech and will fight to keep them, after all the trouble I went through and have experienced, I hope the City Council takes a step far far back to see that this "rise in violence" is a

pathetic attempt to support a biased or manipulated point of view to benefit only those requesting the motion be passed. Sincerely,  
Beña Pat-Loeza Benny.martinez@gmail.com

Re: Council File Number 24-0910

To the Los Angeles City Council,

I am vehemently against this motion and will not accept the premise that this motion is meant to keep the public's safety in mind. My past record as a Los Angeles resident when I was young and US Marine would show that I was an administrator by trade and training, and a security expert by experience having lived in South Central on 33rd and Central during riots in my youth in Watts, and having served in Helmand Province, in Afghanistan in the 2010's.

There are already ordinances in place to keep all public spaces safe from obstruction, detainment, hindrance, etc.

There's a claim being made that is disconnected from actual real life that. I do not see a request being made to support the entire city of Los Angeles and its residents, I see the entire picture and it doesn't revolve around any sensitive individual, organization, religious/political sect, or communities. Here's the disconnect; law enforcement is not meant to be a body guard and they aren't meant to use judgement based on one perspective's biased judgement, they already have their own biases that they "train" to avoid relying on. Giving them a broader scope aimed at taking away anyone's right to freedom of speech, of which protest is protected, the right I went to Afghanistan to protect, does not keep public safety in mind when the fact is there is no violence that comes from peaceful protestors.

If the city council does not visit these peaceful protest sites to communicate and relies only on second hand accounts from folks that wish to eliminate free speech as protected under the US Constitution, then it is easy to see that this entire motion needs to take a back seat and/or be removed in order to focus on more important security risks posed by radical anti-Muslim attitudes, anti-black and anti-brown attitudes, or the even the LASD's attitude on removing the organized gangs within their department. Law enforcement needs less resources until they eliminate gang members, charge them for the crimes they commit and investigate themselves and not broader language to restrict freedom of speech, protesting as protected by the US constitution.

We know what this ordinance means and we are completely against it. I speak for all LA residents that wish to maintain their freedom of speech and will fight to keep them, after all the trouble I went through and have experienced, I hope the City Council takes a step far far back to see that this "rise in violence" is a pathetic attempt to support a biased or manipulated point of view to benefit only those requesting the motion be passed.

Sincerely,  
Beña Pat-Loeza  
Benny.martinez@gmail.com



## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 03:25 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** Our First Amendment rights cannot be infringed upon. The Constitution guarantees our right to assemble, march, and protest on all public streets and sidewalks. Your proposed ordinances disproportionately impact and infringe upon the rights of Jewish, Muslim, and BIPOC protesters who have made up the majority of the recent activists on LA's streets. The proposed policies are absolutely unacceptable for this reason among many.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Eli

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 03:31 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** This is a blatant attempt to stifle first amendment rights under the guise of safety. Find your spine and reject this criminalization of constitutionally protected free speech.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Eleanor Monahan

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 03:35 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** It's embarrassing that this is even something that we have to dissent. Any elected official that supports a protest ban shouldn't be in office. Are Katy Yaroslavy and Bob Blumenfield so out of touch that they think this is actually a good idea? Or are they entirely aware of what they're doing: they want to make decisions in private and on our behalf, and they don't even want to see anyone who could possibly dissent. That way, they can keep selling us out to corporate (specifically Zionist) interests, like they do every single day. That's their job. They're doing it very well. As a constituent of 90005, I do not support the criminalization of protesting outside any facility, regardless of their tax exempt status. It's humiliating to even have to say that, but this country is a humiliating place to live.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Mitt

**Date Submitted:** 09/10/2024 03:36 PM

**Council File No:** 24-0910

**Comments for Public Posting:** Honest question: have you fired the city attorney? You must have, because there's no way they gave their blessing for this. Yaroslavsky, Blumenfield...are you insane? Are you hell-bent on sacrificing all credibility and constitutional rights for the service of, what, being able to brutalize people protesting a genocide? Because let me tell you, they're already being brutalized. While you're trying to figure out the next best way to infringe on civil liberties, the protestors you're champing at the bit to defame are screaming for you to stop supporting these zionist goons and apologists. Fix your hearts, you fucking monsters. Pictured: what you're full throatedly advocating for.



حسام شببات

**ROOF OF THE  
BUILDING**















## Israeli attacks resume at Gaza after humanitarian pause

DEIR AL-BALAH, GAZA - DECEMBER 1: Dead body of a 5-month-old Palestinian baby named Muhammad Hani Al-Zahar, is brought to the Al-Aqsa Martyrs Hospital by his mother Asmahan Attia Al-Zahar and grandfather Attia Abu Amra after the Israeli airstrikes at the end of the humanitarian pause in Deir Al-Balah, Gaza on December 1, 2023. 32 Palestinians were killed within 3 hours of the end of the humanitarian pause in Gaza. (Photo by Ali Jadallah/Anadolu via Getty Images)









