

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 10/15/2024 10:35 AM

Council File No: 24-0910

Comments for Public Posting: Yaroslavsky's motion uses bad-faith "public safety" arguments in order to criminalize protest in public space. It is a blatantly fascist move to restrict freedom of speech. I urge the Council to adopt the opposition to this motion. Otherwise, the Council risks losing its entire legitimacy by making it extremely clear that it does **not** want to hear from its constituency but rather wants to use its authority to silence this community. Banning protest does not make anyone safer--instead, it increases police presence which we know is disproportionately violent to people of color. Frankly, I don't want to spend time making reasonable arguments against such a blatantly unconstitutional, unreasonable proposal. It's clear this motion aims to repress the community and to criminalize dissent, which is against the entire spirit of democracy. I hope the Council can resist Yaroslavsky's turn toward fascism, and I hope my faith is not misplaced.

Communication from Public

Name: Dr. Alissa Matus

Date Submitted: 10/15/2024 07:58 PM

Council File No: 24-0910

Comments for Public Posting: 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: Dan

Date Submitted: 10/15/2024 09:24 PM

Council File No: 24-0910

Comments for Public Posting: A bill to create bubbles or safe zone around hospitals, schools, churches, etc, what a great idea! I am all for it

Communication from Public

Name: S Brownell

Date Submitted: 10/15/2024 09:57 PM

Council File No: 24-0910

Comments for Public Posting: I want to register my support to the motion for an ordinance which would prevent some forms of protestors to approach within a distance from doors of churches, or other places like schools, health clinics,... please vote for it

Communication from Public

Name: Peter

Date Submitted: 10/15/2024 10:22 PM

Council File No: 24-0910

Comments for Public Posting: Concerning regulation to restrict some kind of protesters 100 feet from service facilities The First Amendment of the US Constitution says that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free access thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or the press, or the right of people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. I respect free of speech and everything that it stands for, but along with it we must also have similar rights to not have to listen to disrupting, downgrading or threatening communication from those whose goal is to restrict the right of others. Thus I support the 100' bubble zone around the entrance and egress of institutions which help people to improve their lives, like churches or community centers. Peter B

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 10/15/2024 02:00 PM

Council File No: 24-0910

Comments for Public Posting: I support this motion. Please vote yes. That said, I have one significant concern. I agree with the motion's assertion that severe safety incidents have occurred when aggressive and angry agitators come into close proximity with people trying to access healthcare facilities like abortion clinics and religious institutions. The 8-foot buffer to disallow such conduct in very close proximity to other persons is a common sense, proven approach to solving this issue. Everyone deserves the right to bodily autonomy and personal space; the best way to ensure this is to maintain a physical separation requirement. However, there are some concerns with the proposed 100-foot radius near entrances and language surrounding that requirement. People do have the right to protest and it is unclear the extent to which a 100-foot buffer might impede this right. Therefore, I suggest the council look to modify the 100-foot radius proposal, but keep the eight-foot proposal. I think more people would support this motion if the 100ft part was taken out, but the 8ft part was kept in. Blocking entrances should always be condemned and eight feet is more than reasonable for persons and places.

Communication from Public

Name: S.

Date Submitted: 10/15/2024 04:51 PM

Council File No: 24-0910

Comments for Public Posting: I oppose this bubble zone motion. It limits the rights of people to protest. It sets a dangerous precedent with the broad language being used for locations. What about the ability for union workers to protest? They also can't hand out leaflets of information? There is a lot to question with this motion and hypotheticals that can occur because of the broad language used which make it more subjective as to what is going to be allowed or not. We already have to get permits approved to protest. There is already an increase in police presence. This motion does nothing productive but further the allowing of policing of people. Why not tackle the reasons as to why people are protesting and start with conversations there instead of trying to make it so that we have our first amendment rights infringed upon.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 10/15/2024 06:03 PM

Council File No: 24-0910

Comments for Public Posting: I strongly oppose Councilwoman Yaroslavsky's motion as a concerned community member. I believe the motion will limit our right to free speech and efforts to create positive change, hinder the sharing of vital resources and campaigns, and disproportionately criminalize marginalized communities from using their voices. The broad nature of this motion would criminalize most forms of dissent and protest that are necessary for a democratic city, as well as labor union picketing, voter registration, and public health outreach.