



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

09/18/2022

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 10:56 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 08:38:39 -0700
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Brenda Martinez** <brenda.bhnc@gmail.com>
 Date: Sun, Sep 18, 2022 at 10:01 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 am a member of a Neighborhood Council and urge you to vote to NOT approve the STAP contract with Tranzito/Vector. Why have you not listened to us on this when a majority of the City's Neighborhood Councils have repeatedly advocated against more digital ads in our neighborhoods?

I call your attention to the following concerns:

Safety: When pedestrian deaths are rising, 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.

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,
 Brenda Martinez
 628 S Evergreen Ave
 Los Angeles, CA 90023

----- 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 08:38:51 -0700
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Brenda Martinez** <brenda.bhnc@gmail.com>

Date: Sun, Sep 18, 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 am a member of a Neighborhood Council and urge you to vote to NOT approve the STAP contract with Tranzito/Vector. Why have you not listened to us on this when a majority of the City's Neighborhood Councils have repeatedly advocated against more digital ads in our neighborhoods?

I call your attention to the following concerns:

Safety: When pedestrian deaths are rising, 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.

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,
Brenda Martinez
629 S Evergreen Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90023

----- 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 08:38:25 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Aquiel Godeau** <agodeau1@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Sep 18, 2022 at 9:48 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,
 Aquiel Godeau
 4018 Don Felipe Drive
 Los Angeles, CA 90008

----- 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 08:38:10 -0700
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Karen Sarrow** <karensarrow@gmail.com>
 Date: Sun, Sep 18, 2022 at 8:42 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 am a member of the Studio City Neighborhood Council and urge you to vote to NOT approve the STAP contract with Tranzito/Vector. Why have you not listened to us on this when a majority of the City's Neighborhood Councils have repeatedly advocated against more digital ads in our neighborhoods?

I call your attention to the following concerns:

Safety: When pedestrian deaths are rising, 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.

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,
 Karen Sarrow
 4219 Colfax Ave, Unit D
 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 08:37:57 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Steviann Yanowitz** <steviannkagen@hotmail.com>
Date: Sun, Sep 18, 2022 at 7:17 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,
Steviann Yanowitz
6457 Firmament Ave
Van Nuys, CA 91406

----- 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 08:37:39 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Diane Charles** <dianec0413@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Sep 18, 2022 at 6:30 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,
Diane Charles
1511 W. Valleyheart Dr.
Burbank, CA 91506

----- 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 08:37:25 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Marie DiMassa** <medimassa@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Sep 18, 2022 at 6:25 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,
Marie DiMassa
3725 Myrtle Ave
Long Beach, CA 90807

----- 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 08:37:13 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Miriam Schneider** <mschneidercats@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Sep 18, 2022 at 5:25 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,
Miriam Schneider
12540 Huston St
Valley Village, CA 91607

----- 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 08:37:00 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Joanne Husar** <husarj@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Sep 18, 2022 at 5:14 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,
Joanne Husar
1622 W 25th St
Los Angeles, CA 90007

----- 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 08:36:43 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Marc Woerschling** <mwoersch@att.net>
Date: Sun, Sep 18, 2022 at 5:11 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,
Marc Woerschling
PO Box 4471
Valley Village, CA 91617

----- 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 08:36:29 -0700
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Peter Harris** <peterharris59@netzero.net>
 Date: Sun, Sep 18, 2022 at 4:48 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,
 Peter Harris
 6526 Drexel 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 08:36:15 -0700
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Myron Goldsby** <myronvedanta@gmail.com>
 Date: Sun, Sep 18, 2022 at 4:46 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,
Myron Goldsby
1946 Vedanta Pl
Hollywood, CA 90068

----- 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 08:35:53 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Adam Tinkham** <adamtinkham@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Sep 18, 2022 at 3:06 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,

Adam Tinkham
1769 E Walnut Street
Pasadena, CA 91106

----- 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 08:36:04 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Thomas Haney** <thaney4@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Sep 18, 2022 at 3:25 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,
Thomas Haney
5105 Inglewood Bl apt 104
Culver City, CA 90230

----- 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 08:35:38 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Tara Strand** <quinnster@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Sep 18, 2022 at 2:30 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,
Tara Strand
11127 Hesby St, Unit 7
North Hollywood, CA 91601

----- 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 08:35:14 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Lynda Cook** <opiecook@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Sep 18, 2022 at 2:18 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,
Lynda Cook
26508 Sheldon Ave
Canyon Country, CA 91351

----- 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 08:34:59 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Carol Beule** <cbeule@sbcglobal.net>
Date: Sun, Sep 18, 2022 at 2:11 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,
Carol Beule
3863 Vineland Avenue
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 08:34:46 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Katherine Poole** <pookapoo@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Sep 18, 2022 at 1:56 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,
Katherine Poole
160 S Hudson Ave
Pasadena, CA 91101

----- 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 08:34:34 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Dr. Tony Knight** <tknightdiver@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Sep 18, 2022 at 1:43 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,
Dr. Tony Knight
4524 Wortser 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 08:34:15 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Sabina Lokman** <sablokebay@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Sep 18, 2022 at 1:30 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,
Sabina Lokman
4252 vantage 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 08:33:56 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Barbara Dave** <barbdave2218@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Sep 18, 2022 at 1:17 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 Dave
5938 W. 75 St.
Los Angeles, CA 90045

----- 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 08:33:42 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Michael Lueras** <nonation@outlook.com>
Date: Sun, Sep 18, 2022 at 1:14 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,
Michael Lueras
The People Concern
SANTA MONICASanta Monica, CA 90401

----- 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 08:33:27 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **June Sale** <junessale@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Sep 18, 2022 at 12:57 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,
June Sale
1455 Oriole Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90069

----- 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 08:33:10 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Darren Frale** <darrenfrale@hotmail.com>

Date: Sun, Sep 18, 2022 at 12:51 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,
 Darren Frale
 875 Rome Dr
 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 08:32:58 -0700
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Rosalie Wayne** <roseart747@gmail.com>
 Date: Sun, Sep 18, 2022 at 12:44 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,
Rosalie Wayne
8140 Blackburn Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90048

...

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

85 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**
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
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**
13K



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

09/18/2022

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 11:46 AM

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

From: Aquiel Godeau <agodeau1@gmail.com>
 To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>
 Cc:
 Bcc:
 Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 00:48:13 -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,
 Aquiel Godeau
 4018 Don Felipe Drive
 Los Angeles, CA 90008

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

From: Karen Sarrow <karensarrow@gmail.com>
 To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>
 Cc:
 Bcc:
 Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 23:42:38 -0400
 Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2
 To whom it may concern:

I am a member of the Studio City Neighborhood Council and urge you to vote to NOT approve the STAP contract with Tranzito/Vector. Why have you not listened to us on this when a majority of the City's Neighborhood Councils have repeatedly advocated against more digital ads in our neighborhoods?

I call your attention to the following concerns:

Safety: When pedestrian deaths are rising, 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.

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,
Karen Sarrow
4219 Colfax Ave, Unit D
Studio City, CA 91604

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

From: Steviann Yanowitz <steviannkagen@hotmail.com>
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>
Cc:
Bcc:
Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 22:17:06 -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,
Steviann Yanowitz
6457 Firmament Ave
Van Nuys, CA 91406

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

From: Diane Charles <dianec0413@gmail.com>
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>
Cc:
Bcc:
Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 21:30:24 -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,
Diane Charles
1511 W. Valleyheart Dr.
Burbank, CA 91506

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

From: Marie DiMassa <medimassa@gmail.com>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 21:25:04 -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,
Marie DiMassa
3725 Myrtle Ave
Long Beach, CA 90807

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

From: Miriam Schneider <mschneidercats@gmail.com>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 20:25:52 -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,
Miriam Schneider
12540 Huston St
Valley Village, CA 91607

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

From: Joanne Husar <husarj@gmail.com>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 20:14:04 -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,
Joanne Husar
1622 W 25th St
Los Angeles, CA 90007

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

From: Marc Woersching <mwoersch@att.net>
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>
Cc:
Bcc:
Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 20:11:44 -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,
Marc Woersching
PO Box 4471
Valley Village, CA 91617

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

From: Peter Harris <peterharris59@netzero.net>
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>
Cc:
Bcc:
Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 19:48:51 -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,
Peter Harris
6526 Drexel Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90048

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

From: Thomas Haney <thaney4@gmail.com>
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>
Cc:
Bcc:
Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 18:25:14 -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,
Thomas Haney
5105 Inglewood Bl apt 104
Culver City, CA 90230

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

From: Myron Goldsby <myronvedanta@gmail.com>
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>
Cc:
Bcc:
Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 19:46:52 -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,
Myron Goldsby
1946 Vedanta Pl
Hollywood, CA 90068

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

From: Adam Tinkham <adamtinkham@gmail.com>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 18:06:07 -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,
Adam Tinkham
1769 E Walnut Street
Pasadena, CA 91106

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

From: Tara Strand <quinnster@gmail.com>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 17:30:37 -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,
Tara Strand
11127 Hesby St, Unit 7
North Hollywood, CA 91601

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

From: Lynda Cook <opiecook@gmail.com>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 17:18:22 -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,
Lynda Cook
26508 Sheldon Ave
Canyon Country, CA 91351

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

From: Carol Beule <cbeule@sbcglobal.net>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 17:11:25 -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,
Carol Beule
3863 Vineland Avenue
Studio City, CA 91604

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

From: Katherine Poole <pookapoole@gmail.com>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 16:56:32 -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,
Katherine Poole
160 S Hudson Ave
Pasadena, CA 91101

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

From: "Dr. Tony Knight" <tknightdiver@gmail.com>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 16:43:42 -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,
Dr. Tony Knight
4524 Wortser Ave
Studio City, CA 91604

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

From: Sabina Lokman <sablokebay@gmail.com>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 16:30:14 -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,
Sabina Lokman
4252 vantage ave
Studio city, CA 91604

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

From: Barbara Dave <barbdave2218@gmail.com>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 16:17:57 -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 Dave
5938 W. 75 St.
Los Angeles, CA 90045

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

From: Michael Lueras <nonation@outlook.com>

To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>
 Cc:
 Bcc:
 Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 16:13:58 -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 Lueras
 The People Concern
 SANTA MONICASanta Monica, CA 90401

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

From: June Sale <junessale@gmail.com>
 To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>
 Cc:
 Bcc:
 Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 15:57:21 -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,
June Sale
1455 Oriole Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90069

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

From: Darren Frale <darrenfrale@hotmail.com>
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>
Cc:
Bcc:
Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 15:51:41 -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,
Darren Frale
875 Rome Dr
Los Angeles, CA 90065

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

From: Rosalie Wayne <roseart747@gmail.com>
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>
Cc:
Bcc:
Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 15:44:37 -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,
Rosalie Wayne
8140 Blackburn Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90048

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

From: Charles Vogel <csv@chuckvogel.com>
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>
Cc:
Bcc:
Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 15:40:56 -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,
Charles Vogel
326 S Bentley Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90049

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

From: casey danson <casey@globalpossibilities.org>
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>
Cc:
Bcc:
Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 15:43:38 -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,
casey danson
1136 Rose Avenue Venice
venice, CA 90291

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

From: Amelia Jones <ailema90@gmail.com>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 15:35:18 -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,
Amelia Jones
425 Raymond Ave
Santa Monica, CA 90405

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

From: Sandra Lokman <s.e.lokman@gmail.com>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 15:30:23 -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,
Sandra Lokman
4252 Vantage Ave
Studio City, CA 91604

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

From: SUSAN MEALS <susanmeals@gmail.com>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 15:22:55 -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,
SUSAN MEALS
432 Comstock Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90024

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

From: Ruby Brown <brown5082@sbcglobal.net>
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>
Cc:
Bcc:
Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 15:20:09 -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,
Ruby Brown
4023 W 64th St
Los Angeles, CA 90043

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

From: richard saltsman <r.richardsaltsman@ca.rr.com>
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>
Cc:
Bcc:
Date: Sun, 18 Sep 2022 15:16:15 -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,
richard saltsman
3569 Veteran Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90034

...

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

82 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
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**
8K