

Communication from Public

Name: David S. Spaggiari

Date Submitted: 08/19/2021 12:02 PM

Council File No: 21-0878

Comments for Public Posting: To the Office of the City Clerk of Los Angeles, California I understand that the City Attorney is drafting an ordinance that will require citizens of Los Angeles County to receive a COVID-19 vaccination and to show proof of vaccine upon demand in order to perform and participate in certain activities that are our legal and constitutional right to perform and participate in. I have been a citizen of this county for 61 years and am currently a pastor of a local Church congregation in this county. I am outraged at the prospect of this unconstitutional mandate because it violates my rights on so many levels. It is unconstitutional, illegal, it violates the HIPPA Act of 1996, not to mention the moral and ethical violations. Our elected officials are put in office and paid by us the citizens of Los Angeles to PROTECT AND TO SERVE, not to violate. I am in strong opposition of this action and will be actively making others aware of what is being taken away from us and doing everything in my power to reverse the damage that has already been done. David S. Spaggiari, M.Div. Pastor, Tree of Life Christian Church

Communication from Public

Name: Pastor Tim Bourgeois

Date Submitted: 08/19/2021 11:17 AM

Council File No: 21-0878

Comments for Public Posting: I appeal to you to not follow the flawed and failed leadership of the city of San Francisco in this matter of Vaccination Passports. I fully support all efforts by the City Council to promote city wide vaccinations by providing expert medical information on the benefits of the Covid-19 vaccines. But I urge you not to mandate them or to further divide our already struggling city by such a mandate. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 08/19/2021 04:22 AM

Council File No: 21-0878

Comments for Public Posting: Requiring vaccines is wrong, unprecedented and illegal. Let's not go down this slippery slope. It should be a choice. Thank you!

Communication from Public

Name: Erin Smith

Date Submitted: 08/19/2021 06:52 AM

Council File No: 21-0878

Comments for Public Posting: Vaccine passports will continue to cause division. They are discriminatory, and will likely not have the desired effect you are hoping for. It is also not your job to tell me how to care for my body.

Communication from Public

Name: Leslie Spaggiari
Date Submitted: 08/19/2021 08:08 AM
Council File No: 21-0878

Comments for Public Posting: Hello, I am concerned the council of L.A. wants to implement a so called Vaccine Passport. To begin, it is unconstitutional under the 14th Amendment. My right to bodily autonomy is federally protected. Making people take a medication is not the role of government. It is the role of mothers to their children. Government is to secure and protect liberty to the people. Not take it away. A Vac Passport will also have a severe impact on people of color. That demographic is by far the largest of the un-vaccinated. Discriminating against, and segregating people, became a thing of our past in the 1960's. The Civil Rights Movement made discrimination a thing of our PAST. Why this council thinks it "in the public's best interest" to implement discrimination and segregation is perplexing and frankly, OUTRAGEOUS. It is not progressive, but primitive and hideous....think of drinking fountains labeled "Whites only" and "Colored only"...makes me sick to my stomach. While I understand vaccine's are a great medical advancement, it is a slippery slope to implement mandatory vaccination. Where does it end? Do you then decide poor people should not have children so in the "public's best interest", mandate sterilization to those living in poverty? Or elderly, once their "usefulness" is over, euthanize them? I am hopeful you will see the absurdity, and grotesque notion of the above. May it never be so. Self-governance is something our country (and county) was founded on. It is one of the things that make this place people all over the world wish to get. Do not impose your personal preferences on people with whom you disagree. Thank you, Leslie Spaggiari

Communication from Public

Name: Veronica Bruce

Date Submitted: 08/19/2021 08:27 AM

Council File No: 21-0878

Comments for Public Posting: (Comment 1/2 to oppose) I am writing to OPPOSE this mandate to impose restrictions for indoor spaces on those who are not vaccinated. Furthermore, I oppose any and all mandates that outsource personal authority over health choices. I know you probably just think I'm some health nut who doesn't trust or know the science. I know you probably think I'm an anti-vaxxer who believes in conspiracy theories and is selfish and irrational. I am not here for some catharsis but to truly communicate and make a change. I am pro-health, and I am pro-choice for any and all medical procedures and medications. I believe each individual has experiences, and a certain amount of time to give to self-education according to their curiosities. I believe those who see this covid-19 experimental vaccine as the best choice for them should most definitely have the ability and freedom to take it. I do request that you have an open mind and consider the perspective of those who do not choose this intervention. I also request that you look at Angelenos values and what is important to them. If your priority is public health and not money or agendas, I think you will see this ordinance is harmful for you and the whole community who is pressured by it. My councilwoman is Nithyra Raman, and her office said the reason the council is doing this ordinance is because you are all concerned about the delta and lambda variants being more contagious and deadly. If this ordinance is being created because we are concerned about variants, do we have a test that differentiates delta and lambda on a large scale? Have the mass testing sites changed their type of PCR tests? Furthermore, PCR tests are also emergency use authorized so not the most effective tool alone as they only pick up viral fragments and diagnosing infection demands more diagnosis differential. If you mandate a medical intervention, shouldn't it be extremely effective - so effective against not using that intervention? Relative risk reduction for Pfizer's data when it was initially emergency use authorized was 95%, but that is not the full story. We also know relative risk reduction is waning in how it responds to variants. Taking relative risk reduction as the effectiveness is on the assumption that 100% of those people who got vaccinated would get sick and die without the vaccine. We know that is not the case and the scientific method says we must look at the control group (aka the unvaccinated group). We have

to see the percentage of the same outcome and then do the math to see the difference which gives us absolute risk reduction. Don't take my word for it, just google it. The absolute risk reduction is minuscule - less than 4 percent when looking at Pfizer's data after 6 months. I know this sounds crazy because why would we be pushing an intervention without showing the full picture of how those who don't take that intervention compare? Because: it's common practice for pharmaceuticals to sell their product. It is misleading marketing, and each one of you is complicit in this deceit to the public (by perhaps no fault of your own). If public health is your number one priority, shouldn't we be moving forward with offering other therapeutics and preventatives to those who are hesitant to vaccinate or treatments for those who get infected? Couldn't we do community outreach to educate more on the vitamins that are found deficient in people who have weakened immune systems prone to illness coronavirus or otherwise? Couldn't we do community outreach to coach in lifestyle choices for those with higher risk due to obesity, heart disease, autoimmune issues, and stress? How is there only one solution? Health and wellness is not one size fits all. We know the vaccine has not stopped transmission or infection, so the vaccinated are still getting sick. We know the vaccinated are getting both the original covid-19 and the variants. I will note that I can show you a case where mostly vaccinated people are infected. You would counter that you can show me a study where mostly unvaccinated people are infected. So, it's inconclusive. And some may want to take other effective preventatives and therapeutics or make lifestyle changes over taking a drug that they don't know the long term adverse effects of. You can say adverse effects are very rare, but the tragic truth of the matter is that if you are the one that gets blood clots that cause myocarditis, a miscarriage, Guillain-Barré syndrome, Bells Palsy, a severe autoimmune disease flare up, or death, that life matters. Every death or injury is equal, and that is why we should at least have a choice if we want to experience tragedy from the naturally occurring infection or from the medical intervention.

Communication from Public

Name: Veronica Bruce

Date Submitted: 08/19/2021 08:29 AM

Council File No: 21-0878

Comments for Public Posting: (2/2 continued opposition) Just to reiterate this is still an experimental vaccine. I actually had to correct one of the council member's office representatives which makes me realize I need to take a moment to say, "Yes, it is emergency use authorized or as they just changed the wording to FDA-authorized" which means there is no approval. Trials are still underway. We do not know long term effects. This is a medical experiment. Furthermore, requiring a Covid vaccine which is still experimental as a condition to participate in society is UNLAWFUL COERCION according to CA law. California Laws PROHIBIT this: 24170: This is the Protection of Human Subjects in Medical Experimentation Act 24171: The Legislature hereby finds and declares ... the right of individuals to determine what is done to their own bodies. 24172 This is the "experimental subject's bill of rights," and states that individuals...(j) Be given the opportunity to decide to consent or not to consent to a medical experiment without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, coercion, or undue influence on the subject's decision. Vaccine manufacturers are not held liable for injury of death due to adverse effects. 42 US Code 300aa-22 states "No vaccine manufacturer shall be liable in a civil action for damages arising from a vaccine-related injury or death associated with the administration of a vaccine after October 1, 1988, if the injury or death resulted from side effects that were unavoidable even though the vaccine was properly prepared and was accompanied by proper directions and warnings." Would each council member instead like to be held liable financially and spiritually for harm and death of people who had little choice due to pressures caused by this ordinance? Also, this puts businesses under threat of being hit with discrimination lawsuits for discriminating against those who may be disabled so cannot take the drug and those who have religiously held beliefs. How will this be enforced? How many more funds do we need to go to the policing agencies? How much more privacy do we have to give up making those with an alternative perspective vulnerable to judgment and retaliation? When Los Angeles has shown itself as being a city that would prefer less policing and more community outreach, why are we using a form of policing with this ordinance? Los Angeles has shown they care about the homeless population, but they are

willing to make laws that could force someone into unemployment. Los Angeles has shown they care about mental health, but they are forcing people into betraying themselves that could lead to depression, anxiety, and loss of balance in their identity and personal discernment. Los Angeles has shown that they care about inclusion, but you are taking away rights from those who see alternatives to a solution, and you are willing to exclude them from life, liberty, and happiness. Thank you for your time, consideration, and openness to change your perspective. I will be following up with every council member as I truly want to serve our concern with health and wellness.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 08/19/2021 03:22 PM

Council File No: 21-0878

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Councilmembers, Please accept the attached letter regarding vaccination requirements for entering indoor spaces (21-0878). We look forward to further conversation with you regarding this issue and preventing the contraction of COVID-19 in Los Angeles. Thank you for your consideration.

August 19, 2021



The Honorable Nury Martinez
President, Los Angeles City Council
200 N Spring St., Ste 470
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Vaccination Requirements for Entering Indoor Spaces

Dear President Martinez,

On behalf of the Los Angeles grocery industry, we are reaching out under the invitation by City Council to discuss the Motion relative to vaccination requirements for eligible individuals entering indoor spaces (21-0878). As recognized in Council discussion, attention must be given to ensuring access for all individuals to food and medication. Appropriately, grocery stores have remained open through the entirety of the pandemic in order to keep critical goods and supplies flowing. As the primary provider for essential food and healthcare items we have concerns about any scenario that would deny someone access to these items.

We support the City of Los Angeles in its efforts to combat COVID-19 and the emerging Delta variant. Along with you, we have acted on the need for masking, social distancing, increased sanitization, supporting employees with supplemental sick leave, encouraging vaccinations for both employees and the public, and supporting employees receiving vaccinations through additional time off and incentives. The message from your discussion was clear – and we agree – vaccinations are the primary solution to escaping the impacts of COVID-19. This reasoning is why as an appointed member by Governor Newsom to the CDPH Community Vaccine Advisory Committee we advocated vigorously for and achieved vaccine priority for California’s grocery workers since February.

The challenges with vaccine verification at grocery stores is the possibility that unvaccinated or untested individuals could lose access to food, medicine and necessary health care items. While the grocery industry has offered throughout the pandemic alternatives to shopping in store, including online purchasing with delivery or curbside pick-up and offering shopping options while customers wait outside, these options are not always utilized. We are also concerned with the consequences of denying entry to a grocery store to an individual who is in urgent need of essential items offered by stores due to lack of vaccination or testing proof or if access to that information is not immediately available to them for whatever reason when attempting to enter the store.

As we both agree vaccinations are the ultimate solution to stop the spread of COVID-19. Our industry has actively pursued vaccinating all individuals who are eligible, both employees and customers alike. Grocers throughout Los Angeles are actively offering the vaccine or hosting and promoting vaccination events along with partnering with state and local health departments to promote the need for vaccinations. We welcome opportunities to join the city in its efforts to similarly encourage and facilitate vaccinations for Angelenos.

However, since requiring grocery customers to verify vaccination or negative tests has significant challenges, we welcome conversations between the city and grocers on other policy options aimed directly at preventing the contraction of COVID-19.

The Honorable Nury Martinez
August 19, 2021
PAGE 2



Thank you for your commitment and determination to continue to fight the spread of COVID-19. We look forward to further conversation about the challenges for vaccination and testing verification at grocery stores as well as exploring other strategies and policy options to increase vaccination rates in Los Angeles.

Sincerely,


Timothy James
Director, Local Government Relations
California Grocers Association

CC: Members, Los Angeles City Council
 Mayor Eric Garcetti, City of Los Angeles
 Mr. Mike Feuer, City Attorney, City of Los Angeles
 Ms. Sharon Tso, Chief Legislative Analyst, City of Los Angeles
 Ms. Carolyn M. Hull, General Manager, Los Angeles Economic and Workforce
 Development Department
 Ms. Holly L. Wolcott, City Clerk, City of Los Angeles