



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

**09/19/2022**

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 10:46 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 10:31:07 -0700  
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Scott Jung** <sjung810@hotmail.com>  
 Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 10:19 AM  
 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,  
 Scott Jung  
 124 Monterey Rd Unit 204  
 South Pasadena, CA 91030

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

From: John Poer <john@poerhouse.info>  
 To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
 Cc:  
 Bcc:  
 Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 13:42:02 -0400  
 Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
 To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
John Poer  
19827 Ingomar St  
Winnetka, CA 91306

----- 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 10:30:53 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Clara Solis** <claramsolis@earthlink.net>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 10:16 AM  
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 registered voter who always votes 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,  
Clara Solis  
521 N Avenue 67  
Los Angeles, CA 90042

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

From: Scott Jung <sjung810@hotmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 13:19:20 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Scott Jung  
124 Monterey Rd Unit 204  
South Pasadena, CA 91030

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

From: Clara Solis <claramsolis@earthlink.net>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 13:16:57 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To whom it may concern:

I am a registered voter who always votes 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,  
Clara Solis  
521 N Avenue 67  
Los Angeles, CA 90042

----- 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 09:28:01 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Linnaea Dawson** <dixdawson@mindspring.com>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 9:25 AM  
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,  
Linnaea Dawson  
1824 Micheltorena St.  
Los Angeles, CA 90026

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

From: Linnaea Dawson <dixdawson@mindspring.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 12:25:21 -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,

Linnaea Dawson

1824 Micheltorena St.

Los Angeles, CA 90026

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

From: Office of the City Clerk &lt;cityclerk@lacity.org&gt;

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 08:43:21 -0700

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

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

From: **Rene Pineda** <renepineda4276@att.net>

Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 8:34 AM

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

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

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Rene Pineda  
2000 Ivar Ave Apt 4  
Los Angeles, 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 08:39:21 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Nancy Hubbs-Chang** <Squirebran@earthlink.net>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 1:23 AM  
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,  
Nancy Hubbs-Chang  
77 Patrician Way 3C  
Pasadena, CA 91105

----- 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 08:42:49 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Robert Aronson** <Robert@aronson.law>  
 Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 2:23 AM  
 Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
 To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

To whom it may concern:

Please vote to NOT approve the STAP contract with Tranzito/Vector. This contract is terrible in sooo many ways:

**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.

Thank you.

Sincerely,  
 Robert Aronson  
 108 Catamaran Street  
 Venice, CA 90292

----- 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 08:39:07 -0700  
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Nora and Israel Amrani** <ElleNora13@gmail.com>  
 Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 12:55 AM  
 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,  
Nora and Israel Amrani  
4245 Bellingham Ave  
Studio City, CA 91604

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

From: Rene Pineda <renepineda4276@att.net>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 11:34:07 -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,  
Rene Pineda  
2000 Ivar Ave Apt 4  
Los Angeles, CA 90068


---

#### 12 attachments

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

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

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

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



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

**09/19/2022**

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 2:58 PM

----- 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 14:37:18 -0700  
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Mary Koetting** <mmkoetting@gmail.com>  
 Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 2:36 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,  
 Mary Koetting  
 8910 David Avenue  
 LA, CA 90034

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
 To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
 Cc:  
 Bcc:  
 Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 14:36:56 -0700  
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Kelly Misek** <KJM1400@hotmail.com>

Date: Mon, Sep 19, 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,  
Kelly Misek  
742 S ORANGE GROVE AVE APT 6  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90036

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

From: Kelly Misek <KJM1400@hotmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 17:30:42 -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,  
Kelly Misek  
742 S ORANGE GROVE AVE APT 6  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90036

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

From: Mary Koetting <mmkoetting@gmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 17:36:20 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Mary Koetting  
8910 David Avenue  
LA, CA 90034

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

From: <LionelM85@outlook.com>  
To: "Clerk.RMD@lacity.org" <Clerk.RMD@lacity.org>  
Cc: "Clerk.CPS@lacity.org" <Clerk.CPS@lacity.org>  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 19:42:14 +0000  
Subject: Record Management Division/Council and Public Services Division  
Dear City Clerk,

Hope this email finds you well! I was researching the **City Council File Management System and Record Management Division** looking for a specific 'contract' in the search results. Apparently, there is an issue with the search results. **Jennifer Goodie**, Board Member with Mid-City Neighborhood Council, has tweeted that the '**The Glue**' contract no longer shows up in the search results and or is missing. I want to clarify if the City Clerk is properly maintaining the files and that they are available to the Public without being hidden and or difficult to search. This could be a violation of the law. **Records must be made public and they must be easy to locate for the public to view/review.** Please, fix this issue ASAP.

Thank You!

For Reference:

<https://twitter.com/UnrigLA/status/1571925276573184005?s=20&t=4uZh7KUjXCQShYDuoUWdJA>

<https://twitter.com/jengoodie/status/1571336200233058304?s=20&t=4uZh7KUjXCQShYDuoUWdJA>

Regards,

**Lionel Mares, MPA**  
**Public Sector Management and Leadership**

----- 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 12:10:55 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **dorothy allison** <lmallison@prodigy.net>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 12:04 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,  
dorothy allison  
19837 buttonwillow dr.  
wkinnetka, CA 91306

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

From: dorothy allison <lmallison@prodigy.net>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 15:04:57 -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,  
dorothy allison  
19837 buttonwillow dr.  
wkinnetka, CA 91306

----- 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 12:00:24 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Candace Rocha** <candace8027@gmail.com>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 11:40 AM  
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,  
Candace Rocha

4423 Alpha St  
Los Angeles, CA 90032

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

From: Candace Rocha <candace8027@gmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 14:40:50 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Candace Rocha  
4423 Alpha St  
Los Angeles, CA 90032

----- 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 11:57:46 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **casey danson** <casey@globalpossibilities.org>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 11:37 AM  
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,  
casey danson  
1136 Rose Avenue Venice  
venice, CA 90291

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

From: casey danson <casey@globalpossibilities.org>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 14:37:01 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
casey danson  
1136 Rose Avenue Venice  
venice, CA 90291

----- 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 11:27:24 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Dawn Robinson** <dawnie\_robinson@hotmail.com>

Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 11:25 AM  
 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,  
 Dawn Robinson  
 1155 Hacienda Pl  
 West Hollywood, CA 90069

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

From: Dawn Robinson <dawnie\_robinson@hotmail.com>  
 To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
 Cc:  
 Bcc:  
 Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 14:25:22 -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,  
Dawn Robinson  
1155 Hacienda Pl  
West Hollywood, 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 11:16:04 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Jessica Craven** <jescny@gmail.com>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 11:00 AM  
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,  
Jessica Craven  
4673 Cleland Ave  
Los Angeles, CA 90065

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

From: Jessica Craven <jescny@gmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 14:00:37 -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,  
Jessica Craven  
4673 Cleland Ave  
Los Angeles, CA 90065

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 10:54:20 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **John Poer** <[john@poerhouse.info](mailto:john@poerhouse.info)>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 10:42 AM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <[CityClerk@lacity.org](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
John Poer

19827 Ingomar St  
Winnetka, CA 91306

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

From: Robert Aronson <Robert@aronson.law>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 05:23:12 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To whom it may concern:

Please vote to NOT approve the STAP contract with Tranzito/Vector. This contract is terrible in sooo many ways:

**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.

Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Robert Aronson  
108 Catamaran Street  
Venice, CA 90292

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

From: Nancy Hubbs-Chang <Squirebran@earthlink.net>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 04:23:39 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

protecting.

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

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

Sincerely,  
Nancy Hubbs-Chang  
77 Patrician Way 3C  
Pasadena, CA 91105

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

From: Nora and Israel Amrani <ElleNora13@gmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 03:55:17 -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,  
Nora and Israel Amrani  
4245 Bellingham Ave  
Studio City, CA 91604

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

From: Brenda Martinez <brenda.bhnc@gmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 01:16:11 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
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

---

#### 20 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
-  **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
-  **Record Management Division/Council and Public Services Division.eml**  
16K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **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



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

**09/19/2022**

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 3:19 PM

----- 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 15:15:54 -0700  
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Chris Van hook** <ccvanhook@gmail.com>  
 Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:14 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,  
 Chris Van hook  
 337 Via de la Paz  
 Pacific Palisades, CA 90272

----- 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 15:15:43 -0700  
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Victoria Miller** <vemiller0426@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:15 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <[CityClerk@lacity.org](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Victoria Miller  
15857 Moorpark St  
Encino, CA 91436

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <[cityclerk@lacity.org](mailto:cityclerk@lacity.org)>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <[clerk.cps@lacity.org](mailto:clerk.cps@lacity.org)>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 15:15:26 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Nancy Glassberg** <[glassbergnancy@gmail.com](mailto:glassbergnancy@gmail.com)>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:14 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <[CityClerk@lacity.org](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Nancy Glassberg  
426 N Orange Dr  
Los Angeles, CA 90036

----- 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 15:15:01 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Robert Chirpin** <gldlight@hotmail.com>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:14 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,  
Robert Chirpin  
18520 Vincennes St  
Northridge, CA 91324

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

From: Victoria Miller <vemiller0426@gmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 18:15:29 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Victoria Miller  
15857 Moorpark St  
Encino, CA 91436

----- 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 15:14:46 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Susan P. Walp** <susanwalp@gmail.com>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:13 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,  
Susan P. Walp  
1234 El Mirador Dr  
Pasadena, CA 91103

----- 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 15:14:33 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Marcia Hobbs** <[marcia@marciahobbs.com](mailto:marcia@marciahobbs.com)>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:13 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <[CityClerk@lacity.org](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Marcia Hobbs  
824 North Avenida Palmas  
Palm Springs, CA 92262

----- 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 15:14:18 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Kelly Misk** <[kjm1400@hotmail.com](mailto:kjm1400@hotmail.com)>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:11 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <[CityClerk@lacity.org](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Kelly Misek  
742 S Orange Grove Ave Apt 6  
Los Angeles, CA 90036

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

From: Chris Van hook <ccvanhook@gmail.com>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 18:14:55 -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,  
Chris Van hook  
337 Via de la Paz  
Pacific Palisades, CA 90272

----- 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 15:14:06 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Patrick Frank** <plf@grabados.org>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:10 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,  
Patrick Frank  
1622 Crescent Pl  
Venice, CA 90291

----- 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 15:13:53 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **david ambroz** <davidambroz@gmail.com>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:09 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,  
david ambroz  
611 N. Bronson Ave, #9  
Los Angeles, CA 90004

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

From: Nancy Glassberg <glassbergnancy@gmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 18:14:28 -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,  
Nancy Glassberg  
426 N Orange Dr  
Los Angeles, CA 90036

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

From: Robert Chirpin <gldlight@hotmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 18:14:22 -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,  
Robert Chirpin  
18520 Vincennes St  
Northridge, CA 91324

----- 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 15:13:42 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Christine Sneed** <sneedchristine@gmail.com>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:08 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,  
Christine Sneed  
1769 E. Walnut Street  
Pasadena, CA 91106

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

From: "Susan P. Walp" <susanwalp@gmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 18:13:50 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Susan P. Walp  
1234 El Mirador Dr  
Pasadena, CA 91103

----- 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 15:13:12 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Alexander Fierro-Clarke** <alexfierro.film@gmail.com>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:08 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 15:12:57 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Lonnie Sheinart** <spirited808@gmail.com>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:08 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,  
Lonnie Sheinart  
12108 Ivy Pl LA  
LA, CA 90064

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

From: Marcia Hobbs <marcia@marciahobbs.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 18:13:10 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Marcia Hobbs  
824 North Avenida Palmas  
Palm Springs, CA 92262

----- 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 15:12:24 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Harlan Lebo** <hjlbo@gmail.com>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:08 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,  
Harlan Lebo  
PO Box 614  
La Mirada, CA 90637

----- 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 15:12:10 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Julie Adelson** <jpadelson@gmail.com>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:08 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,  
Julie Adelson  
910 W Paseo Del Mar  
San Pedro, CA 90731

----- 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 15:11:57 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Stacey Smith-Clark** <staceysmithclark@gmail.com>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:07 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,  
Stacey Smith-Clark  
3008 Shipway Ave  
Long Beach, CA 90808

----- 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 15:11:45 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Renee Klein** <renee\_klein@hotmail.com>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:03 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,  
Renee Klein  
4732 la Villa marina  
MdR, CA 90292

----- 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 15:11:19 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Dudley and Candace Campbell** <cdcampbl@roadrunner.com>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:01 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 urge you to vote to NOT approve the STAP contract with Tranzito/Vector. I call your attention to the following concerns:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Dudley and Candace Campbell  
13167 Ortley Pl  
Van Nuys, CA 91401

----- 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 15:11:32 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Judith Giglio** <judith.giglio@sbcglobal.net>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:03 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,  
Judith Giglio  
8344 PENFIELD AVENUE  
Winnetka, CA 91306

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

From: Kelly Misek <kjm1400@hotmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 18:11:24 -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,  
Kelly Misek  
742 S Orange Grove Ave Apt 6  
Los Angeles, CA 90036

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

From: Patrick Frank <plf@grabados.org>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 18:10:20 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Patrick Frank  
1622 Crescent Pl  
Venice, CA 90291

...

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



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

**09/19/2022**

1 message

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

Tue, Sep 20, 2022 at 10:06 AM

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

From: Marika Sung <marikasung@gmail.com>  
 To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
 Cc:  
 Bcc:  
 Date: Tue, 20 Sep 2022 02:53:55 -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,  
 Marika Sung  
 6208 Warner dr  
 LA, CA 90048

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

From: Pamela Gibberman <pgibberman@gmail.com>  
 To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
 Cc:  
 Bcc:  
 Date: Tue, 20 Sep 2022 02:37:23 -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,  
Pamela Gibberman  
9209 Kester Ave  
Panorama City, CA 91402

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

From: "G. Saffren" <gsaffren@gmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Tue, 20 Sep 2022 02:05:07 -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,  
G. Saffren  
2100 Malcolm Ave  
Los Angeles, CA 90025

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

From: Dennis Trembly <trembly@usc.edu>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Tue, 20 Sep 2022 02:08:21 -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,  
Dennis Tremblay  
27616 Longhill Dr  
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

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

From: Susan Requa <srequa@gmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Tue, 20 Sep 2022 01:49:59 -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 Requa  
4339 3rd Ave  
Los Angeles, CA 90008

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

From: Janet Reichmann <jreichmann@comstockhills.com>  
 To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
 Cc:  
 Bcc:  
 Date: Tue, 20 Sep 2022 01:48:35 -0400  
 Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
 To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
 Janet Reichmann  
 1429 Comstock Ave.  
 Los, CA 90024

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

From: mary robinson <maryrobinson0266@sbcglobal.net>  
 To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
 Cc:  
 Bcc:  
 Date: Tue, 20 Sep 2022 01:40:44 -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,  
mary robinson  
woodrow wilson  
la, CA 90046

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

From: Mary Glazer <hlpmaryg@gmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Tue, 20 Sep 2022 01:30:15 -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,  
Mary Glazer  
4922 Range View Ave  
Los Angeles, CA 90042

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

From: Mel Marcus <earthmamamel@hotmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Tue, 20 Sep 2022 00:51:10 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

**Equity:** Fiscal pressures apparently require that the early installations of transit shelters be done in affluent areas where the highest revenues will be

generated. This repeats the injustices of the current program where transit riders in the hottest areas will have to wait for shelters. For how long?

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Mel Marcus  
5718 e scrivener st  
Long beach, CA 90808

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

From: Cordi Koga <stradsrus@gmail.com>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Tue, 20 Sep 2022 00:45:43 -0400

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

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Cordi Koga  
29403 Stonecrest Rd  
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

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

From: "A.L. Watts" <agneswatts@shaw.ca>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Tue, 20 Sep 2022 00:30:32 -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,  
A.L. Watts  
1712 Winmar Dr  
Los Angeles, CA 90065

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

From: Elana Buegoff <ebuegoff@netzeto.net>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Tue, 20 Sep 2022 00:25:42 -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,  
Elana Buegoff  
6506 Hayes Dr  
Los Angeles, CA 90048

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

From: Patricia Mace <patriciamace@ca.rr.com>  
 To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
 Cc:  
 Bcc:  
 Date: Tue, 20 Sep 2022 00:20:04 -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: NO DIGITAL ADS AT BUS STOPS

Privacy: NO DATA COLLECTED FROM PUBLIC TRANSPORT USERS

Cost: NO DIGITAL ADS AT ALL IN PUBLIC BUS STOPS. SEATS THAT DO NOT GET HOT IN THE SUN LIKE METAL ONES = NO METAL SEATING. COVERS FOR SHADE AT EACH AND EVERY BUS STOP.

Equity: BUS STOPS TO BE ISLANDS OF CALM WITH GREENERY FOR COOLNESS AND BEAUTY FOR THE RIDERS

Aesthetics: "Great streets" are not defined by their advertising structures. Protection of the public right-of-way from commercialization is a value worth protecting. = NO ADS DIGITAL OR OTHERWISE

Sustainability: Energy conservation is a hallmark of a truly green city. NO DIGITAL ADS OR ANY OTHER VISUAL BLIGHT - ONLY GREENERY AND GOOD SHADE AND COOL SEATS TO SIT ON, NOT METAL SEATING = TOO HOT IN SUMMER AND UNCOMFORTABLE COLD IN WINTER !!

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,  
 Patricia Mace  
 1835 S Wooster St  
 LA, CA 90035

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

From: Norman Goss <gossnje@earthlink.net>  
 To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
 Cc:  
 Bcc:  
 Date: Tue, 20 Sep 2022 00:15:33 -0400  
 Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
 To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
 Norman Goss  
 1200 Valley View Rd #308

Glendale, CA 91202

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

From: Ruth Doxide &lt;ruthdoxsee@sbcglobal.net&gt;

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Tue, 20 Sep 2022 00:03:12 -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,  
Ruth Doxide  
17128 Baltar Street  
Van Nuys, CA 91406

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

From: Julia Keplinger &lt;julia.keplinger@gmail.com&gt;

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Tue, 20 Sep 2022 00:00:27 -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,  
Julia Keplinger  
1649 S Hobart Blvd  
Los Angeles, CA 90006

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

From: Brad Kane <bkane@kanelaw.la>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 23:58:35 -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,  
Brad Kane  
1154 S Crescent Heights Blvd.  
Los Angeles, CA 90035

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

From: Carrie Henderson <studiohenderson2@gmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 23:56:24 -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,  
Carrie Henderson  
4003 Goodland Ave  
Studio City, CA 91604

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

From: Olivia Dibs <olivia.dibs@gmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 23:55:20 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Olivia Dibs  
9824 Hillhaven Ave  
Tujunga, CA 91042

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

From: GEENA DURAN <beelzebabe@gmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 23:43:02 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
GEENA DURAN  
233 E Walnut Ave  
Monrovia, CA 91016

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

From: sharon byers <sibyrs@gmail.com>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 23:54:47 -0400

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

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
sharon byers  
13042 Stanbridge Ave  
Downey, CA 90242

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

From: Jeff Gould <jeffdgould@gmail.com>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 23:12:08 -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,  
Jeff Gould  
220 W 5th St  
Los Angeles, CA 90013

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

From: Sheila Winston <sheshe@mybunnyday.com>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 23:22:07 -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,  
Sheila Winston  
24303 Woolsey Cyn Road  
West Hills, CA 91304

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

From: Felicia Chase <beadlmnia@gmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 23:03:59 -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,  
Felicia Chase  
16027 Ventura Blvd Ste 200  
Encino, CA 91436

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

From: Karen Ridgley <karenridgley4ppcc@gmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 22:17:12 -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,  
Karen Ridgley  
16128 Northfield St  
Pacific Palisades, CA 90272

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

From: Joyce Wilber <jwilbertheboss7@gmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 21:52:59 -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,  
Joyce Wilber  
9237 La Salle Ave  
Los Angeles, CA 90047

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

From: Arthur Delgadillo <gloriaferro414@gmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 21:46:19 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Arthur Delgadillo  
713 N Loma Vista Dr  
Long Beach, CA 90813

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

From: Margarita Perez <marjor@ca.rr.com>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 21:40:17 -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,  
Margarita Perez  
13859 Graber Ave  
Sylmar, CA 91342

----- 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 17:55:26 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Stacey Behlmer** <smbehlmer@gmail.com>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 5:47 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,  
Stacey Behlmer  
3972 Tropical Dr  
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 17:54:22 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Michael Tullius** <tullius@ucla.edu>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 5:44 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,  
Michael Tullius  
5229 Balboa Blvd. Unit 13  
Encino, CA 91316

...

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

---

#### 95 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**  
6K
-  **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



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

**09/19/2022**

1 message

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

Tue, Sep 20, 2022 at 10:08 AM

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

From: Julia Griswold <griswold.julia@gmail.com>  
 To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
 Cc:  
 Bcc:  
 Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 19:02:06 -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. The light pollution is already a hazard to everything living here, the waste of energy is unconscionable in a climate crisis, they are distracting and dangerous, and wireless devices collecting cell phone data from passersby is psychotic, are you kidding? This contract extends a terrible idea for a long time, and if you vote for it you're making a harmful, greedy mistake.

Sincerely,  
 Julia Griswold  
 469 Museum 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 16:01:51 -0700  
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Kathryn Welch Howe** <khowe.kwh@gmail.com>  
 Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 4:01 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 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,  
Kathryn Welch Howe  
10570 Le Conte Ave  
Los Angeles, CA 90024

----- 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 15:59:16 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Amelia Jones** <ailema90@gmail.com>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:58 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,  
Amelia Jones  
425 Raymond Ave.  
Santa Monica, CA 90405

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

From: Kathryn Welch Howe <khowe.kwh@gmail.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 19:01:34 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

**Cost:** The CAO's report makes clear that there are actually no revenue guarantees, and yet the City will be required to spend over \$230 million to launch

STAP. This is fiscally irresponsible. Costs and revenues are uncertain. The City has taken on the fiscal responsibility and duty to implement vast elements of the program (as well as the public automated toilet program for which there have not been sufficient funds identified).

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Kathryn Welch Howe  
10570 Le Conte Ave  
Los Angeles, CA 90024

----- 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 15:54:57 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **lynne weiske** <movieblonde@hotmail.com>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:51 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,  
lynne weiske  
6128 Wilshire Blvd  
Los Angeles, CA 90048

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

From: Amelia jones <ailema90@gmail.com>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 18:58:48 -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: 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 15:54:18 -0700

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

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

From: **Juanita Kempe** <juanitakempe@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:49 PM

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

To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

To whom it may concern:

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,  
 Juanita Kempe  
 658 S Mansfield Ave  
 Los Angeles, CA 90036

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

From: lynne weiske <movieblonde@hotmail.com>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 18:51:13 -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,  
 lynne weiske  
 6128 Wilshire Blvd  
 Los Angeles, CA 90048

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

From: Juanita Kempe <juanitakempe@gmail.com>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 18:49:58 -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,  
 Juanita Kempe  
 658 S Mansfield Ave  
 Los Angeles, CA 90036

----- 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 15:47:14 -0700  
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Carlos Nunez** <cnunez001@ca.rr.com>  
 Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:46 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,  
Carlos Nunez  
18009 Victory Blvd  
Reseda, CA 91335

----- 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 15:47:02 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Janice Tarr** <janice337@gmail.com>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:45 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,  
Janice Tarr  
11420 Berwick St.  
L.A., CA 90049

----- 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 15:46:36 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Cipra Nemeth** <cipran@gmail.com>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:41 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,  
Cipra Nemeth  
6600 Lindenhurst Ave  
Los Angeles, CA 90048

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

From: Carlos Nunez <cnunez001@ca.rr.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 18:46:01 -0400  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Carlos Nunez  
18009 Victory Blvd  
Reseda, CA 91335

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

From: Janice Tarr <janice337@gmail.com>  
 To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
 Cc:  
 Bcc:  
 Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 18:45:14 -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,  
 Janice Tarr  
 11420 Berwick St.  
 L.A, CA 90049

----- 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 15:41:16 -0700  
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **TIA TRIPLETT** <tia@anlf.com>  
 Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:37 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,  
TIA TRIPLETT  
3959 Berryman Ave  
Los Angeles, CA 90066

----- 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 15:41:01 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: '**SANDY HUBBARD**' via Clerk - CityClerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:35 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,  
SANDY HUBBARD  
11911 Magnolia Blvd  
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 15:40:48 -0700  
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Terrence Butler** <[butlerterrance@sbcglobal.net](mailto:butlerterrance@sbcglobal.net)>  
 Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:35 PM  
 Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
 To: City Clerk <[CityClerk@lacity.org](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
 Terrence Butler  
 14410 Valerio St Apt 104  
 Van Nuys, CA 91405

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

From: Cipra Nemeth <[cipran@gmail.com](mailto:cipran@gmail.com)>  
 To: City Clerk <[clerk.cps@lacity.org](mailto:clerk.cps@lacity.org)>  
 Cc:  
 Bcc:  
 Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 18:41:21 -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,  
Cipra Nemeth  
6600 Lindenhurst 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 15:39:52 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Tim Hanson** <timhans@gmail.com>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:34 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

From: TIA TRIPLETT <tia@anlf.com>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 18:37:07 -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,  
TIA TRIPLET  
3959 Berryman Ave  
Los Angeles, CA 90066

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

From: SANDY HUBBARD <sandy@magazinec.com>

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 18:35:21 -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,  
SANDY HUBBARD  
11911 Magnolia Blvd  
Valley Village, CA 91607

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

From: Terrence Butler <butlerterrance@sbcglobal.net>  
 To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
 Cc:  
 Bcc:  
 Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 18:35:14 -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,  
 Terrence Butler  
 14410 Valerio St Apt 104  
 Van Nuys, CA 91405

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

From: Tim Hanson <timhans@gmail.com>  
 To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
 Cc:  
 Bcc:  
 Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 18:34:00 -0400  
 Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
 To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

It would be best to revisit STAP from the start, but consideration should at least be postponed for at least 6 months so that critical questions can be

answered, changes made to reflect the problems identified, and a proper CEQA environmental review implemented. A 10 to 20-year contract deserves the full attention of all those involved and requires careful evaluation. A hurried approval to meet the Oct. 14 "last date to act" would represent both a terrible injustice and a glaring example of a lost opportunity to make a genuine contribution to improving the quality of life of all transit riders --an opportunity that may not return for another decade.

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

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

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

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

From: **Victoria Brandon** <[wyandotte@sbcglobal.net](mailto:wyandotte@sbcglobal.net)>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:31 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <[CityClerk@lacity.org](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Victoria Brandon  
9311 Bianca  
Northridge Northridge, CA 91325

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 15:33:04 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Faye Rye** <[raindance100@gmail.com](mailto:raindance100@gmail.com)>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:30 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <[CityClerk@lacity.org](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Faye Rye  
5208 Calle Mayor  
Torrance, CA 90505

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 15:32:53 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Evelyn Stern** <stern123@earthlink.net>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:29 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Evelyn Stern  
12367 Deerbrook Ln  
Los Angeles, CA 90049

----- 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 15:32:36 -0700  
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Nicole Siskind** <NSiskind@gmail.com>  
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 3:29 PM  
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2  
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

To whom it may concern:

RE: CF 20-1536 and 20-1536-S2

I write to urge you to vote against the proposed STAP contract with Tranzito-Vector, LLC currently under consideration.

I urge you to vote against adopting the CEQA findings as conveyed by the Board of Public Works.

I urge you to vote against the IS/MND as presented.

I urge you to vote against the Mitigation Monitoring Program prepared for the IS/MND as attached to the BPW report of May 11, 2022.

I urge you to seek additional financial analysis of the Program's projected costs and revenues, the comparison of final bidders and the programs offered.

I urge you to request the City Attorney to comment on impacts that the proposed program may have on the City's ability to regulate off-site signage (including billboards) within the framework of past court rulings.

I urge you to request the Dept. of Transportation to review current studies related to driver distraction and changing digital billboards.

I urge you to release a red-line version of the contract showing changes made by the CAO's office.

The STAP Program will introduce more unwanted and unsafe digital signage to LA neighborhoods and public rights of way while failing to provide transit riders with adequate shade and shelter across our vast metropolitan area. The total number of proposed shelters will cover LESS THAN HALF of today's transit stops. Providing 75% of riders in each council district with a proposed shelter does not mean that the riders most in need will be provided shelter.

A final note: Under the current contract Councilmember offices all get an equal share of 50% of the revenues from the Street Furniture contract for a council district discretionary fund account. Where will any revenues go from the new program?

Thank you for your attention and consideration.

Sincerely,  
Nicole Siskind  
836 Wonder View Drive  
Calabasas, CA 91302

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

From: Victoria Brandon <wyandotte@sbcglobal.net>  
To: City Clerk <clerk.cps@lacity.org>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 2022 18:31:18 -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,  
Victoria Brandon  
9311 Bianca  
Northridge Northridge, CA 91325

...

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

---

#### 41 attachments

-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
5K
-  **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
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
8K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**  
13K
-  **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
-  **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
-  **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
-  **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**