



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

**09/17/2022**

1 message

**City Clerk Council and Public Services** <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
 To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>

Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 11:06 AM

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
 To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
 Cc:  
 Bcc:  
 Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:18:09 -0700  
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Maïke Both** <maikeboth@gmail.com>  
 Date: Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 11:32 PM  
 Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
 To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

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,  
 Maïke Both  
 8025 Blackburn Ave  
 Los Angeles, CA 90048

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
 To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
 Cc:  
 Bcc:  
 Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:17:47 -0700  
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Dudley and Candace Campbell** <cdcampbl@roadrunner.com>

Date: Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 11:29 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <[CityClerk@lacity.org](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

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,  
Dudley and Candace Campbell  
13167 Ortleby Place  
Valley Glen, CA 91401

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <[cityclerk@lacity.org](mailto:cityclerk@lacity.org)>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <[clerk.cps@lacity.org](mailto:clerk.cps@lacity.org)>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:17:34 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Jan Harrell** <[janharrell.now@gmail.com](mailto:janharrell.now@gmail.com)>  
Date: Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 11:26 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <[CityClerk@lacity.org](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

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,  
Jan Harrell  
5914 Nora Lynn  
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:17:22 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Maggie Kenedy** <maggie.kenedy@gmail.com>  
Date: Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 11:20 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

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,  
Maggie Kenedy  
101 1/2 N Primrose Ave  
Alhambra, CA 91801

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:17:11 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Faye Rye** <[raindance100@gmail.com](mailto:raindance100@gmail.com)>

Date: Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 11:17 PM

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

To: City Clerk <[CityClerk@lacity.org](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

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,  
Faye Rye  
5208 Calle Mayor  
Torrance, CA 90505

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <[cityclerk@lacity.org](mailto:cityclerk@lacity.org)>

To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <[clerk.cps@lacity.org](mailto:clerk.cps@lacity.org)>

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:16:54 -0700

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

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

From: **Pierre Vuilleumier** <[pierrevuilleumier@gmail.com](mailto:pierrevuilleumier@gmail.com)>

Date: Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 11:16 PM

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

To: City Clerk <[CityClerk@lacity.org](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

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,  
Pierre Vuilleumier  
3704 Kelton Ave.  
Los Angeles, CA 90034

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:16:42 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Donald Sage Mackay** <donsage@sbcglobal.net>  
Date: Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 11:14 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

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,  
Donald Sage Mackay  
4506 San Andreas Ave  
Los Angeles, CA 90065

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:

Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:16:30 -0700  
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Claude Rush** <clauder@thetstuntman.com>  
 Date: Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 10:49 PM  
 Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
 To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

To whom it may concern:

WHAT IS THIS? A SATURDAY NIGHT LIVE SKETCH?  
 \$240 million to purchase 3,000 planned shelters.  
 ARE THEY MADE OUT OF GOLD?  
 WHO CARES ABOUT PRIVACY, THAT'S GONE.  
 BUT IT IS PATHETIC TO SEE THAT INCOMPETENT CITY PLANNERS ARE STILL IN CHARGE OF THIS CITY.

THAT MONEY (MY MONEY) WOULD BE BETTER USED TO BUY A FEW MORE BUSES OR TO ADD A COUPLE OF TRAINS FOR THE METRO.  
 THINK, YOU WILL BE ABLE TO PLASTER AS MANY BILLBOARD ALL OVER THE TUNNELS.  
 I AM DREAMING! \$240 MILLIONS???

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

Sincerely,  
 Claude Rush  
 821 Stradella Rd  
 L.A., CA 90077

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
 To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
 Cc:  
 Bcc:  
 Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:16:14 -0700  
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Tim Hanson** <timhans@gmail.com>  
 Date: Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 10:43 PM  
 Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
 To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

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,  
Tim Hanson  
223 Strand St Apt F  
Santa Monica, CA 90405

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:15:59 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Barbara Epstein** <justbarb56@gmail.com>  
Date: Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 10:30 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

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,  
Barbara Epstein  
230 The Village Unit 305  
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:15:46 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Michael Gross** <mpgross1doc@gmail.com>  
Date: Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 10:29 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

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,  
Michael Gross  
4021 Meadow Lark Dr  
Calabasas, CA 91302

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:15:33 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Alexander Fierro-Clarke** <alexfierro.film@gmail.com>  
Date: Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 10:21 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

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,  
Alexander Fierro-Clarke  
1356 Douglas St Apt 16  
Los Angeles, CA 90026

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:15:19 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Jennifer Goss** <[gossnje@earthlink.net](mailto:gossnje@earthlink.net)>  
Date: Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 10:20 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <[CityClerk@lacity.org](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

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,  
Jennifer Goss

1200 Valley View Rd  
Glendale, CA 91202

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:15:04 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Gina Truex** <ginaetruex@gmail.com>  
Date: Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 10:19 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

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,  
Gina Truex  
246 Angelo Place  
Arcadia, CA 91006

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:14:32 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Steve Graff** <stevegraff12@hotmail.com>  
Date: Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 10:16 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

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,  
Steve Graff  
1948 Malcolm Ave  
Los Angeles, CA 90025

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:14:20 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Laurie Rittenberg** <[lrittenberg@sbcglobal.net](mailto:lrittenberg@sbcglobal.net)>  
Date: Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 10:15 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <[CityClerk@lacity.org](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

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,  
Laurie Rittenberg  
4063 Farmdale Ave  
Studio City, CA 91604

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:14:08 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **John Miller** <miller@johnmillerpr.com>  
Date: Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 10:06 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

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,  
John Miller  
928 Oak Ridge Rd  
Los Gatos, CA 95033

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:13:55 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Jeffrey Findeis** <PhallenAngel1957@outlook.com>  
Date: Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 9:59 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

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,  
Jeffrey Findeis  
200 E Anaheim St Apt 529  
Long Beach, CA 90813

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:13:43 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **dante Alencastre** <raisingzoey@gmail.com>  
Date: Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 9:54 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

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,  
dante Alencastre  
1632 n. laurel ave.  
los angeles, CA 90046

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:13:32 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Janet Albaugh** <[janalbaugh@roadrunner.com](mailto:janalbaugh@roadrunner.com)>  
Date: Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 9:35 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <[CityClerk@lacity.org](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

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,  
Janet Albaugh  
2750 Hutton Dr  
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:13:19 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Philip Dagort** <[pdagort@sbcglobal.net](mailto:pdagort@sbcglobal.net)>  
Date: Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 9:21 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <[CityClerk@lacity.org](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>



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,  
Philip Dagort  
17350 Citronia St  
Northridge, CA 91325

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:13:06 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Leslie Gonzales** <lesliedan25@gmail.com>  
Date: Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 9:18 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

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,  
 Leslie Gonzales  
 45556 60th Street West  
 Lancaster, CA 93536

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
 To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
 Cc:  
 Bcc:  
 Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:12:48 -0700  
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Ann Dorsey** <adedorsey@hotmail.com>  
 Date: Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 9:18 PM  
 Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
 To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

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,  
 Ann Dorsey  
 18042 Schoenborn St Apt 5  
 Northridge, CA 91325

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
 To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
 Cc:  
 Bcc:  
 Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:12:37 -0700  
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **R. Ian** <rudjnk@sbcglobal.net>  
 Date: Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 9:15 PM

Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <[CityClerk@lacity.org](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

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,  
R. Ian  
17017 Faysmith Ave.  
Torrance, CA 90504

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <[cityclerk@lacity.org](mailto:cityclerk@lacity.org)>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <[clerk.cps@lacity.org](mailto:clerk.cps@lacity.org)>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:12:25 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Andrea Birnbaum** <[ap@empirepictures.net](mailto:ap@empirepictures.net)>  
Date: Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 9:14 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <[CityClerk@lacity.org](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

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,  
Andrea Birnbaum  
5200 Wilshire  
LA, CA 90036

...

[Message clipped] [View entire message](#)

---

**54 attachments**

-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
12K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K



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

**09/17/2022**

1 message

**City Clerk Council and Public Services** <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
 To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>

Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 12:05 PM

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

From: Maïke Both &lt;maikeboth@gmail.com&gt;

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 02:32:09 -0400

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

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,  
 Maïke Both  
 8025 Blackburn Ave  
 Los Angeles, CA 90048

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

From: Faye Rye &lt;raindance100@gmail.com&gt;

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 02:35:01 -0400

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

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,  
Faye Rye  
5208 Calle Mayor  
Torrance, CA 90505

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

From: Dudley and Candace Campbell <cdcampbl@roadrunner.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 02:29:20 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
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,  
Dudley and Candace Campbell  
13167 Ortley Place  
Valley Glen, CA 91401

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

From: Jan Harrell <janharrell.now@gmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 02:26:18 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
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,  
Jan Harrell  
5914 Nora Lynn  
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

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

From: Maggie Kenedy <maggie.kenedy@gmail.com>

To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 02:20:36 -0400

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

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,  
Maggie Kenedy  
101 1/2 N Primrose Ave  
Alhambra, CA 91801

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

From: Pierre Vuilleumier <pierreuilleumier@gmail.com>

To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 02:16:30 -0400

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

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,

Pierre Vuilleumier

3704 Kelton Ave.

Los Angeles, CA 90034

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

From: Donald Sage Mackay <donaldsage@sbcglobal.net>

To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 02:14:11 -0400

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

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,  
Donald Sage Mackay  
4506 San Andreas Ave  
Los Angeles, CA 90065

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

From: Claude Rush <clauder@thetstuntman.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 01:49:18 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To whom it may concern:

WHAT IS THIS? A SATURDAY NIGHT LIVE SKETCH?  
\$240 million to purchase 3,000 planned shelters.  
ARE THEY MADE OUT OF GOLD?  
WHO CARES ABOUT PRIVACY, THAT'S GONE.  
BUT IT IS PATHETIC TO SEE THAT INCOMPETENT CITY PLANNERS ARE STILL IN CHARGE OF THIS CITY.

THAT MONEY (MY MONEY) WOULD BE BETTER USED TO BUY A FEW MORE BUSES OR TO ADD A COUPLE OF TRAINS FOR THE METRO.  
THINK, YOU WILL BE ABLE TO PLASTER AS MANY BILLBOARD ALL OVER THE TUNNELS.  
I AM DREAMING! \$240 MILLIONS???

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

Sincerely,  
Claude Rush  
821 Stradella Rd  
L.A., CA 90077

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

From: Tim Hanson <timhans@gmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 01:43:14 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
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,  
Tim Hanson  
223 Strand St Apt F  
Santa Monica, CA 90405

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

From: Barbara Epstein <justbarb56@gmail.com>

To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 01:30:29 -0400

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

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,  
Barbara Epstein  
230 The Village Unit 305  
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

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

From: Michael Gross <mpgross1doc@gmail.com>

To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 01:29:45 -0400

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

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,  
Michael Gross  
4021 Meadow Lark Dr  
Calabasas, CA 91302

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

From: Alexander Fierro-Clarke <alexferro.film@gmail.com>

To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 01:21:21 -0400

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

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,  
Alexander Fierro-Clarke  
1356 Douglas St Apt 16  
Los Angeles, CA 90026

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

From: Jennifer Goss <gossnje@earthlink.net>

To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 01:20:19 -0400

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

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,  
Jennifer Goss  
1200 Valley View Rd  
Glendale, CA 91202

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

From: Gina Truex <ginaetruex@gmail.com>

To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 01:19:49 -0400

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

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,  
Gina Truex  
246 Angelo Place  
Arcadia, CA 91006

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

From: Steve Graff <stevegraff12@hotmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 01:16:39 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
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,  
Steve Graff  
1948 Malcolm Ave  
Los Angeles, CA 90025

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

From: Laurie Rittenberg <lrittenberg@sbcglobal.net>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 01:15:00 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
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,  
Laurie Rittenberg  
4063 Farndale Ave  
Studio City, CA 91604

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

From: John Miller <miller@johnmillerpr.com>

To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 01:06:36 -0400

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

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,  
John Miller  
928 Oak Ridge Rd  
Los Gatos, CA 95033

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

From: Jeffrey Findeis <PhallenAngel1957@outlook.com>

To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 00:59:02 -0400

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

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,  
Jeffrey Findeis  
200 E Anaheim St Apt 529  
Long Beach, CA 90813

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

From: Janet Albaugh <janalbaugh@roadrunner.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 00:35:50 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
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,  
Janet Albaugh  
2750 Hutton Dr  
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

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

From: dante Alencastre <raisingzoey@gmail.com>

To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 00:54:30 -0400

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

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,  
dante Alencastre  
1632 n. laurel ave.  
los angeles, CA 90046

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

From: Leslie Gonzales <lesliedan25@gmail.com>

To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 00:18:38 -0400

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

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,  
Leslie Gonzales  
45556 60th Street West  
Lancaster, CA 93536

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

From: Philip Dagort <pdagort@sbcglobal.net>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 00:21:34 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
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,  
Philip Dagort  
17350 Citronia St  
Northridge, CA 91325

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

From: "R. Ian" <rudjnk@sbcglobal.net>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 00:15:11 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
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,  
R. Ian  
17017 Faysmith Ave.  
Torrance, CA 90504

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

From: Ann Dorsey <aedorsey@hotmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 00:18:33 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
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,  
Ann Dorsey  
18042 Schoenborn St Apt 5  
Northridge, CA 91325

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

From: Andrea Birnbaum <ap@empirepictures.net>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 00:14:10 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
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,  
Andrea Birnbaum  
5200 Wilshire  
LA, CA 90036

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

From: lynne weiske <movieblonde@hotmail.com>

To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 00:13:11 -0400

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

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,  
lynne weiske  
6128 Wilshire  
Los Angeles, CA 90048

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

From: Harlan Lebo <hjlebo@gmail.com>

To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
 Cc:  
 Bcc:  
 Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 00:06:49 -0400  
 Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
 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,  
 Harlan Lebo  
 PO Box 614  
 La Mirada, CA 90637

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

From: Rich Van Heertum <rjv@ucla.edu>  
 To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
 Cc:  
 Bcc:  
 Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 00:02:43 -0400  
 Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
 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,  
Rich Van Heertum  
10923 Landale Street  
Toluca Lake, CA 91602

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

From: Sharon Levine <shoshanadance@gmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 00:02:09 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
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,  
Sharon Levine  
8105 Hanna Ave.  
Canoga Park, CA 91304

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

From: Constance Boukidis <constanceellen@sbcglobal.net>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Sat, 17 Sep 2022 23:57:29 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
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,  
Constance Boukidis  
1545 Ensley Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90024

...

[Message clipped] [View entire message](#)

---

**54 attachments**

-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K