



## Ordinance held over -- what does that mean?

1 message

**Barbara Broide** <bbroide@hotmail.com>

Mon, Sep 26, 2022 at 4:03 AM

To: "clerk.cps@lacity.org" <clerk.cps@lacity.org>

I note that the Council File message for STAP and the new LAMC had an interesting twist. While the CF that advanced the adoption of the STAP contract/program was posted as adopted, the file for the actual LAMC contains surprising language relating to a "hold over" provision. What is that about? What does that mean?

**Council File Number:** [20-1536](#)

**Council File Title:** Sidewalk and Transit Amenities Program (STAP) / Public Engagement / Request for Proposals

**Latest Action Taken:**

Date	Activity
09/20/2022	Council adopted item, subject to reconsideration, pursuant to Council Rule 51; Ordinance held over to September 28, 2022

-----  
I drafted the following after the STAP hearing and the adoption of the program. It would be sent to Kevin Keller in the Mayor's office with cc to Kevin James and Greg Good who are apparently now housed in the Mayor's office having failed in their pursuit of elected office and are no longer on the dole as Public Works Commissioners.

Is this a purely emotional catharsis that should remain in my laptop, or does it have any value? Or, should it be converted into a CityWatch post of some kind?

Good evening gentlemen,

Congratulations on your advancement of and the adoption of the STAP program as presented by the Department and Board of Public Works.

You may have seen my recent columns on STAP in CityWatch. You may have chosen to ignore the hundreds of comments in the file and CIS statements ( many in opposition not posted on the agenda and others inaccurately listed as in favor on the Council agenda). The program is a shell, a hollow promise that needs significant revision and re-imagining to honestly claim to be planning to deliver shade and shelter to those in need in a timely manner.

It isn't hard to understand why such a poorly conceived program has been adopted. The Mayor's office was pressing for it. Councilmember were tired of hearing about it. There was no benefit for any of them speaking out against it given how it was framed. Who would vote against providing shade and shelter to transit riders? Hmmm. The perfect "no win" situation. Fight for something better and you appear to be a bag guy.

Some have said that the program moved forward in order to give the Mayor a "win" and an opening for raising funds from advertising on the public right-of-way. How can this be considered to be a win when it delivers a fleeting "feel good" moment followed by a failure to protect transit riders already roasting in the sun? How can it be considered a win when there is built in injustice and a failure to provide equitable shade and shelter across the City? While it sounds good to say that 75% of riders in each Council District will have shade and shelter, the very selection of such a measure demonstrates the lack of attention to detail that plagues this program and should have rendered it dead on arrival with the message conveyed that better work be done. It will potentially leave hundreds (thousands) of Angelenos in the hottest locations without shade. But, if ad revenues and a political win were more important than substance and aiding transit riders, then all is well.

As to the goal to open up our public right-of-way to advertising, where is the win in that? Who will benefit most and why is the Mayor carrying water for them? Tourists come to LA to see the HOLLYWOOD SIGN, not sidewalk ads and banners hanging from our street lights (that may actually obscure views of the Hollywood sign).

If there is some other reason for the advancement of this program, I would sincerely like to understand what it is because it certainly isn't evident.

You are likely aware that the STAP MND is an abomination and the insertion of the new LAMC within it defies any respect for CEQA and was part of a disingenuous process. I personally resent having to invest time and energy to pursue litigation against the City over the MND. Any future proposed advertising program should undergo a public review specific to that program and not be hidden under the STAP LAMC's coattails.

The failure of this administration to create a meaningful street furniture program is stunning. It is not a difficult task to craft a program that will provide transit users with what they need while also generating desired revenues from advertising. It can even be done without blighting our streets with commercial messaging. It can be done if the Mayor "and Company" desire it to be done.

The failure to explore any other opportunities to fashion an alternative plan is stunning.

We have proposed an alternative hybrid plan that will succeed where STAP is designed to fail. Your office should be interested in pursuing such a plan. The process should have resulted in such a plan percolating up for discussion. Sadly, DPW and those involved have been so wedded to the current plan/project that any better options were never considered.

Make time for them to be discussed. You owe it to the transit riders and the City. And, in the end, a new program could be created, adopted and fully implemented that is a shining example of a positive legacy -- not a shabby one.

Barbara Broide



City Clerk Council and Public Services &lt;clerk.cps@lacity.org&gt;

**Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2**

1 message

**Office of the City Clerk** <cityclerk@lacity.org>

Mon, Sep 26, 2022 at 12:25 PM

To: City Clerk Council and Public Services &lt;clerk.cps@lacity.org&gt;

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Amelia Jones** <ailema90@gmail.com>

Date: Sat, Sep 24, 2022 at 2:11 AM

Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

To: City Clerk &lt;CityClerk@lacity.org&gt;

To whom it may concern:

I urge you to vote to NOT approve the STAP contract with Tranzito/Vector. I call your attention to the following concerns:

**Safety:** When pedestrian deaths are rising to frightening levels, placing digital displays at bus stops will only exacerbate distracted driving.

**Privacy:** The City does not appear to understand the threat to personal privacy posed by wireless devices collecting cell phone data from passersby. The City claims that only "anonymous" data will be collected, but does not explain how it will verify this when a private company will actually be operating the system. Anonymous" data can be used to target individuals through re-identification, a practice commonly used by data brokers.

**Cost:** The CAO's report makes clear that there are actually no revenue guarantees, and yet the City will be required to spend over \$230 million to launch STAP. This is fiscally irresponsible. Costs and revenues are uncertain. The City has taken on the fiscal responsibility and duty to implement vast elements of the program (as well as the public automated toilet program for which there have not been sufficient funds identified).

**Equity:** Fiscal pressures apparently require that the early installations of transit shelters be done in affluent areas where the highest revenues will be generated. This repeats the injustices of the current program where transit riders in the hottest areas will have to wait for shelters. For how long?

**Billboard Ordinance/ Sign Regulations:** It appears that one of the main reasons the City is pushing STAP is to revise the LAMC to remove current protections against advertising structures on the PUBLIC right-of-way and to allow all manners of commercial advertising structures without limit. The City claims to be helping transit riders, but it appears the true motivation for the program is to facilitate the generation of advertising revenues.

**Aesthetics:** "Great streets" are not defined by their advertising structures. Protection of the public right-of-way from commercialization is a value worth protecting.

**Sustainability:** Energy conservation is a hallmark of a truly green city. These digital structures consume energy, pollute the night sky, and impact the lives of the smaller creatures with whom we share the landscape does not meet best sustainability practices.

It would be best to revisit STAP from the start, but consideration should at least be postponed for at least 6 months so that critical questions can be answered, changes made to reflect the problems identified, and a proper CEQA environmental review implemented. A 10 to 20-year contract deserves the full attention of all those involved and requires careful evaluation. A hurried approval to meet the Oct. 14 "last date to act" would represent both a terrible injustice and a glaring example of a lost opportunity to make a genuine contribution to improving the quality of life of all transit riders --an opportunity that may not return for another decade.

Sincerely,

Amelia Jones

425 Raymond Ave

Santa Monica, CA 90405