

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Liz Amsden

**Date Submitted:** 09/18/2022 02:05 PM

**Council File No:** 20-1536

**Comments for Public Posting:** The concept of providing over 3,000 transit structures for Angelenos ensuring that 75% of bus riders in each district have access to shelter from sun and rain is commendable, however the proliferation of advertisements which would come with the current plan is not acceptable. Significantly increasing the number of digital ads which is a known driver distractor will increase danger for commuters of all types. Furthermore, it appears that language contained in the Sidewalk & Transit Amenities Program plan would further open the door to advertisers placing billboards, digital ads and kiosks in the public right of way. Another significant danger for drivers, riders and pedestrians, and a visual blight. Hydration stations and hand sanitizing dispensers (except for commuters allergic to alcohol), finally upgrading the system to provide real-time transit information, the addition of WIFI and charging stations, emergency call features, cooling device options plus bicycle/scooter docks and e-lockers is also commendable. But are they included in the budget? Additionally, some of this would allow and even encourage the solicitation of personal information. As a victim of identity theft myself, I am shocked that the City would even consider allowing an outside commercial company to collect personal data from cell phones through their tech installed that they install in their proposed digital displays at OUR bus stops targeting OUR commuters. There appears to be no provision for oversight and accountability which is part of the unspoken contract the City must maintain with all of its residents. The opt-in language is particularly disturbing as these are often couched in such byzantine terms, hidden in out-of-the-way screens or pop up and seize approval before the person can read the small print IF they can read the small print. I am also concerned that yet again, after being called out for manipulative disbursement of impacts on prior City projects that those who gave input may have been misled by the bells and whistles without understanding some of the risks. There does not appear to have been any sort of environmental review which considering the scope is essential. And the Mitigated Negative Declaration is totally inadequate considering the nebulousness of these plans. Finally, if the City has to pay for it all, i.e. out of my taxes, why is this private company even involved? There are too many fuzzy areas to address before this is

considered further. Please kick it back to the appropriate departments forthwith and come up with a better, more detailed and fully transparent plan before spending ANY General Fund dollars.