submitted to Plan. 07-1175 Ita #1
File #7

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE
2018 JAN 23 PM 2:31
CITY CLERK
BY _____ DEPUTY



of the California Coastal Act of 1976.

(c) That the Interpretive Guidelines for Coastal Planning and Permits as established by the California Coastal Commission dated February 11, 1977 and any subsequent amendments thereto have been reviewed, analyzed, and considered in light of the individual project in making its d

(d) That the decision of the permit gran
plicable decision of the California Coastal Co
the Public Resources Code.

(e) If the development is located betwe
shoreline of any body of water located within
in conformity with the public access and pub
California Coastal Act of 1976.

True
Los Angeles Municipal Code
12.20.2.G.1.(f)


(f) Any other finding or findings as may be required for the development by the California Environmental Quality Act.

2. Conditions of App[illegible]proving an application for a Permit under the provisions of this Section, the City shall impose such reasonable terms and conditions as it deems necessary to assu[illegible] a development that is in accordance with the provisions of the California Coast[illegible]ct of 1976 and those other criteria set forth in the preceding paragraph.

3. Notification — A copy of the permit granting authority's action approving, conditionally approving or disapproving any application for a Coastal Development Permit, along with any findings made and conditions imposed in connection therewith, shall be mailed to the applicant and to any person or persons who, in writing, request a copy of such action.

H. Appeals. Appeals from the approval, conditional approval, or disapproval of a Permit under the provisions of this section, may be taken by the applicant or any aggrieved person as follows:

1. Where a Coastal Development Permit hearing has been combined with the hearing on the project itself, an appeal may be taken to the appellate body that would


Corrupt alteration of LAMC 12.20.2.G.1.(f)
LA City Officials knowingly keep publishing
False/Fraudulent operative word "Coastal"
True word is "Quality"
This falsehood denies People & Courts protections
per CEQA - CA PRC 21000 et seq.
AMERICAN LEGAL Publishing Corporation
(b) That the
conformity with Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act of 1976.
(c) That the Interpretative Guidelines for Coastal Planning and Permits as established by the California Coastal Commission dated February 11, 1977 and any subsequent amendments thereto have been reviewed, analyzed, and considered in the light of the individual project in making its determination.
(d) That the decision of the permit granting authority has been guided by any applicable decision of the California Coastal Commission pursuant to Section 30625(c) of the Public Resources Code.
(e) If the development is located between the nearest public road and the sea or shoreline of any body of water located within the coastal zone, that the development is in conformity with the public access and public recreation policies of Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act of 1976.
(f) Any other finding or findings as may be required for the development by the California Environmental Coastal Act.
Los Angeles Times
CALIFORNIA
MONDAY, JANUARY 22, 2018 ▪ LATIMES.COM/CALIFORNIA
UC

Submitted to PLUM-07-1175 Item #1
File #77

January 23, 2018

To: Los Angeles City Councilmembers Planning and Land Use Management Committee (PLUM)

JOSE HUIZAR (Chair)
MARQUEECE HARRIS-DAWSON
MITCHELL ENGLANDER
BOB BLUMENFIELD
CURREN D. PRICE, JR

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE
2018 JAN 23 PM 2:32
CITY CLERK
BY _____ DEPUTY

From: Lia Renee Memsic
334 Aderno Way, 90272,
Los Angeles, California

Re: United States Memo referred to in #ReleaseTheMemo

Dear Councilmembers,

Per the California Constitution Article 1, section 3 (a), I instruct you to direct the US House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (HPSCI) to release unredacted the memo identified by US House representatives on Thursday, January 18, 2018, which memo was authored by the HPSCI, ("#ReleaseTheMemo").

The basis for my instruction is:

1- I am an American Citizen (exhibit 1).
2- I am a Citizen of California (See City of Los Angeles BOE entry record)
3- I am equally entitled to the rights and protection of the U.S. Constitution
    a. and to the California Constitution (exhibit 2)
        i. CONS Article 1 Section 1
            All people are by nature free and independent and have inalienable rights. Among these are enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and pursuing and obtaining safety, happiness, and privacy.
        ii. CONS Article 1 Section 3 (a)
            The people have the right to instruct their representatives, petition government for redress of grievances, and assemble freely to consult for the common good.
4- I made the decision to instruct Public Officials to #ReleaseTheMemo of my own free will.
5- My property in Los Angeles, California has been subjected to harm by actions of Public Officials.
6- I continue to be impacted by Public Officials and their violations of the rule of law in California.
7- I sent tweets under Twitter user name @LiaInLA directing government officials to #ReleaseTheMemo. One such tweet, dated January 19, 2018 is attached (see exhibit 3).
8- In a false and misleading letter signed by Senator Dianne Feinstein and Congressman Adam B. Schiff, dated January 23, 2018 (exhibit 4), it is falsely alleged that I as a member of the public have been influenced by Russia. My request to #ReleaseTheMemo was not influenced by Russia.
9- I believe public records reveal that the January 23, 2018 Feinstein & Schiff letter was written to divert Peoples attention and to cover-up wrong doing by California's City, State & Federal Officials.
10- As a Citizen of California, I instruct you to demand US Officials #ReleaseTheMemo unredacted.

Sincerely,

Lia Renee Memsic
@LiaInLA

(exhibits 1-4 attached
for a Total of 7 pages)


We the People
Of the United States,
in Order to form a more perfect Union,
establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility,
provide for the common defence,
promote the general Welfare, and secure
the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and
our Posterity, do ordain and establish this
Constitution for the United States of America.
PASSPORT
PASSEPORT
PASAPORTE
USA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
USA
MEMSIC
LIA RENEE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Exhibit # 1

*** CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION - CONS**

ARTICLE I DECLARATION OF RIGHTS [SECTION 1 - SEC. 32] *(Article 1 adopted 1879.)*

SECTION 1. All people are by nature free and independent and have inalienable rights. Among these are enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and pursuing and obtaining safety, happiness, and privacy.

(Sec. 1 added Nov. 5, 1974, by Proposition 7. Resolution Chapter 90, 1974.)

SEC. 2. (a) Every person may freely speak, write and publish his or her sentiments on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of this right. A law may not restrain or abridge liberty of speech or press.

(b) A publisher, editor, reporter, or other person connected with or employed upon a newspaper, magazine, or other periodical publication, or by a press association or wire service, or any person who has been so connected or employed, shall not be adjudged in contempt by a judicial, legislative, or administrative body, or any other body having the power to issue subpoenas, for refusing to disclose the source of any information procured while so connected or employed for publication in a newspaper, magazine or other periodical publication, or for refusing to disclose any unpublished information obtained or prepared in gathering, receiving or processing of information for communication to the public.

Nor shall a radio or television news reporter or other person connected with or employed by a radio or television station, or any person who has been so connected or employed, be so adjudged in contempt for refusing to disclose the source of any information procured while so connected or employed for news or news commentary purposes on radio or television, or for refusing to disclose any unpublished information obtained or prepared in gathering, receiving or processing of information for communication to the public.

As used in this subdivision, "unpublished information" includes information not disseminated to the public by the person from whom disclosure is sought, whether or not related information has been disseminated and includes, but is not limited to, all notes, outtakes, photographs, tapes or other data of whatever sort not itself disseminated to the public through a medium of communication, whether or not published information based upon or related to such material has been disseminated.

(Sec. 2 amended June 3, 1980, by Prop. 5. Res.Ch. 77, 1978.)

SEC. 3. (a) The people have the right to instruct their representatives, petition government for redress of grievances, and assemble freely to consult for the common good.

(b) (1) The people have the right of access to information concerning the conduct of the people's business, and, therefore, the meetings of public bodies and the writings of public officials and agencies shall be open to public scrutiny.

(2) A statute, court rule, or other authority, including those in effect on the effective date of this subdivision, shall be broadly construed if it furthers the people's right of access, and narrowly construed if it limits the right of access. A statute, court rule, or other authority adopted after the effective date of this subdivision that limits the right of access shall be adopted with findings demonstrating the interest protected by the limitation and the need for protecting that interest.

(3) Nothing in this subdivision supersedes or modifies the right of privacy guaranteed by Section 1 or affects the construction of any statute, court rule, or other authority to the extent that it protects that right to privacy, including any statutory procedures governing discovery or disclosure of information concerning the official

Exhibit #2



Lia In LA
@LiaInLA

Replying to @DevinNunes

Thank you.
#ReleaseTheMemo



8:23 PM - 19 Jan 2018

10 Retweets **36** Likes



10 10 36

Exhibit # 3

Congress of the United States
Washington, DC 20515

January 23, 2018

Mark Zuckerberg
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Facebook Inc.
1 Hacker Way
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Mr. Jack Dorsey
Chief Executive Officer
Twitter, Inc.
1355 Market Street
Suite 900
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Dorsey and Mr. Zuckerberg:

We seek your companies' urgent assistance. Public reports indicate that accounts linked to the Russian government are again exploiting Twitter and Facebook platforms in an effort to manipulate public opinion.[1] These recent Russian efforts are intended to influence congressional action and undermine Special Counsel Mueller's investigation, which has already resulted in the indictments of two Trump campaign officials and guilty pleas from two others, who are both now cooperating with prosecutors. It is critically important that the Special Counsel's investigation be allowed to proceed without interference from inside or outside the United States. That is why we seek your assistance in our efforts to counter Russia's continuing efforts to manipulate public opinion and undermine American democracy and the rule of law.

Specifically, on Thursday, January 18, 2018, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (HPSCI) Majority voted to allow Members of the U.S. House of Representatives to review a misleading talking points "memo" authored by Republican staff that selectively references and distorts highly classified information. The rushed decision to make this document available to the full

[1] Natasha Bertrand, "Russia-linked Twitter accounts are working overtime to help Devin Nunes and Wikileaks," Business Insider, Jan. 19, 2018; Ken Dilanian and Mike Memoli, "Right-wing demand to #ReleaseTheMemo endorsed by Russian bots, trolls," NBC News, January 19, 2018; Warren Strobel and Jonathan Landay, "In fight over Russia memo, Republicans have unusual ally," Reuters, January 19, 2018.

PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER

Exhibit # 4

House of Representatives was followed quickly by calls from some quarters to release the document to the public.

Several Twitter hashtags, including *#ReleaseTheMemo*, calling for release of these talking points attacking the Mueller investigation were born in the hours after the Committee vote.[2] According to the German Marshall Fund's Alliance for Securing Democracy, this effort gained the immediate attention and assistance of social media accounts linked to Russian influence operations.[3] By Friday, January 19, 2018, the *#ReleaseTheMemo* hashtag was "the top trending hashtag among Twitter accounts believed to be operated by Kremlin-linked groups."[4] Its use had "increased by 286,700 percent" and was being used "100 times more than any other hashtag" by accounts linked to Russian influence campaigns.[5] These accounts are also promoting an offer by WikiLeaks to pay up to $1 million to anyone who leaks this classified partisan memo.

If these reports are accurate, we are witnessing an ongoing attack by the Russian government through Kremlin-linked social media actors directly acting to intervene and influence our democratic process. This should be disconcerting to all Americans, but especially your companies as, once again, it appears the vast majority of their efforts are concentrated on your platforms. This latest example of Russian interference is in keeping with Moscow's concerted, covert, and continuing campaign to manipulate American public opinion and erode trust in our law enforcement and intelligence institutions.

We understand Facebook and Twitter have developed significant expertise in identifying inauthentic and malicious accounts. Further, your forensic investigations into Russian government exploitation of your platforms during the 2016 U.S. election have helped expose to the American public the vast extent of Russia's covert influence efforts. We therefore request that your companies conduct an in-depth forensic examination of this real-time activity on your platforms to determine:

1. whether and how many accounts linked to Russian influence operations are involved in this campaign;

---

[2] See, e.g., Fox News, "Hannity," January 18, 2018, available at http://www.foxnews.com/transcript/2018/01/18/reps-jim-jordan-and-matt-gaetz-on-fisa-abuses.html.
[3] Bertrand, supra, note 1.
[4] Ali Breland, "Russian Twitter accounts pushing for release of 'shocking' surveillance memo," The Hill, Jan. 19, 2018.
[5] Id.

2. the frequency and volume of their postings on this topic: and

3. how many legitimate Twitter and Facebook account holders have been exposed to this campaign.

Given the urgency of this matter, we ask that you provide a public report to Congress and the American public by January 26, 2018. In addition, we urge your companies to immediately take necessary steps to expose and deactivate accounts involved in this influence operation that violate your respective user policies.

Sincerely,

Dianne Feinstein
United States Senator

Adam B. Schiff
Member of Congress