

Communication from Public

Name: Citizens for a Better Los Angeles/Casey Maddren
Date Submitted: 06/17/2025 10:49 PM
Council File No: 22-1154-S1
Comments for Public Posting: Citizens for a Better Los Angeles submits the attached comments on the proposal to issue an RFP for an interactive kiosk program. Our primary concerns are: 1) The author of the motion, Councilmember McOsker, previously worked as a lobbyist for interactive kiosk company IKE Smart City; 2) Previous efforts by city officials to award IKE with a contract for kiosks raise serious ethical questions; 3) Interactive kiosks can collect personal information from members of the public, including teens with cell phones; 4) The kiosk program could hamper the financial success of the existing STAP program. Our detailed comments are attached.



Citizens for a Better Los Angeles

June 17, 2025

Los Angeles City Council
LA City Hall
200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Ethics Concerns Re McOsker Motion for Interactive Kiosk RFP
Further Privacy & Financial Issues
City Council Agenda for June 18, 2025, Item 33
Council File 22-1154-S1

Dear Members of the LA City Council,

Citizens for a Better Los Angeles is writing to express its serious concerns about ethics, privacy and finance related to the motion to issue an RFP for interactive kiosks. Our concerns are as follows:

- The motion's author, Councilmember McOsker, has worked as a lobbyist for interactive kiosk company IKE Smart City.
- There have already been two previous occasions when city officials moved to bypass a competitive process to select IKE.
- Interactive kiosks collect data from the public, and IKE's privacy policy raises serious privacy concerns, including the collection of data from minors.
- The installation of kiosks could compete with the STAP program, undermining the City's investment of over \$300,000,000 on capital expenditures for STAP.

Our detailed comments on each of these issues are below.

ETHICS

1. According to Ethics Commission records, the author of the motion, Councilmember McOsker, worked as a lobbyist for IKE Smart City from 2019 through 2021. Orange Barrel Media and their subsidiary IKE Smart City have been lobbying to put their digital kiosks on LA city streets since 2017. The fact that Councilmember McOsker, a former lobbyist for IKE, is behind this motion to push the RFP process forward raises questions about his motives and suggests that there could be conflict of interest.

2. There have already been significant irregularities in the City's process which suggest that Orange Barrel/IKE has been successful in using aggressive lobbying to influence decisions made by various City entities:

- *In 2017, the CAO of the LA Tourism & Convention Board signed an LOI with IKE stating that they were entering into an "exclusive relationship", and agreed that neither party would "enter into any agreement, discussion or negotiation" that would "compete with, interfere with or prevent the transaction contemplated hereby." Why the LATCB would enter into an exclusive agreement without conducting an open vendor selection process is hard to understand.*
- *In 2022, Councilmember Joe Buscaino presented a motion proposing that the City of LA bypass the normal competitive bidding process and direct the City Attorney to prepare a contract with IKE "piggybacking" on IKE's existing contract with the City of Houston.*

Buscaino Motion Re "Piggyback" Agreement with IKE, 10/4/22

https://clkrep.lacity.org/online/docs/2022/22-1154_mot_10-04-22.pdf

I THEREFORE MOVE that the City Attorney, with the assistance of the City Tourism Department, Bureau of Street Services and all other relevant departments, prepare and present an agreement within 30 days with IKE Smart City, LLC, utilizing the competitive RFP process conducted by the City of Houston, Texas, for the installation and maintenance of interactive kiosks in the City of Los Angeles.

The City Attorney responded with a letter which offered several reasons why the City should not follow this course of action. Here's excerpt:

Letter from City Attorney, 10/20/2022

https://clkrep.lacity.org/online/docs/2022/22-1154_rpt_ATT_10-20-22.pdf

Other factors to consider would be whether it would be in the City's best interest to utilize a competitive process to award a contract because the City has already been put on notice that other vendors exist to perform this scope of work.

The fact that city officials have twice made efforts to steer a kiosk contract toward IKE, without a competitive bidding process, raises questions about whether these officials were acting in the best interest of the public.

PRIVACY

3. Installing interactive kiosks in the public sphere raises serious privacy issues. A person's interactions with the kiosks often involve sharing personally identifiable information (PII), and in most cases there are no meaningful guarantees that the information will be kept secure. For instance, IKE Smart Cities' privacy policy acknowledges that the company collects personal information, including IP address, device name, phone numbers, email addresses and biometric information.

IKE Smart Cities Privacy Policy

<https://www.ikesmartcity.com/documents/en/privacy-policy.html>

While IKE claims that it does not sell personal information, its privacy policy acknowledges that this information is or can be disclosed to its third-party partners, its parents, subsidiaries and affiliates, and/or any entity who acquires, by any means, some or all of the assets or ownership interests of IKE Smart City. What's even more disturbing, the language of the policy seems to indicate that IKE knowingly collects data from minors over the age of 13.

Before approving the issuance of an RFP for any interactive kiosk program, the City should thoroughly investigate how the kiosks could compromise the privacy of Angelenos and visitors to the City.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

According to the 2022 STAP Rollout Schedule, the City has committed to spending \$380,471,227 on capital expenditure costs to finance the STAP program. Does the City really want to start another program to compete with STAP, which could hamper Tranzito-Vector's ability to reimburse the City?

Aside from the existing STAP program, the City has also approved the installation of 70 digital billboards under an agreement with Metro. Now the City is considering a further intrusion into the public right-of-way by allowing the installation of scores of digital kiosks. In order to preserve our rapidly shrinking public space, protect the privacy of Angelenos, and to reduce the spread of advertising blight, the City should seriously consider doing a holistic study of outdoor advertising in LA, and create a comprehensive program that would guide future efforts. Currently, it appears that the City is grabbing at any program that could produce revenue, without considering the long-term impacts.

Thank you for your time.

Casey Maddren
Citizens for a Better Los Angeles

Communication from Public

Name: Noel Gould

Date Submitted: 06/17/2025 11:51 AM

Council File No: 22-1154-S1

Comments for Public Posting: Ciry Councilmembers, I'm strongly opposed to the IKE RFP and the prospect of having hundreds of these kiosks spread throughout all areas of the city especially without any regard for community concerns regarding their impact and where they're placed. Moreover, our city already has two programs in place that are already being deployed and that have proven to be sensitive to community concerns, are ultimately self funding, and provide much needed shielding from the heat and the sun, something the IKE system doesn't do. The STAP program, for example, is designed, for lack of a better comparison, like LEGO's so that the necessary pieces to build the perfect bus stop shelter/shield/information structure for the area with the demographic needs of the community most accurately met is unique in this type of industry, and which the City ALREADY supports, but unfortunately, the IKE would cause material harm to the STAP program by overrunning communities, diluting the available capital advertising dollars, and making it extremely difficult for a community centric system like STAP to survive. I urge you to please vote NO on the IKE program. We have no need for a third system and certainly not a third system only focused on their bottom line rather than the communities they're purported to serve. Thank you! Sincerely, Noel Gould, writing as an individual rather than as a member of the Coastal San Pedro Neighborhood Council

Communication from Public

Name: Charley M Mims

Date Submitted: 06/17/2025 08:27 PM

Council File No: 22-1154-S1

Comments for Public Posting: Honorable Los Angeles City Council: I oppose Item #33 on the City Council agenda for Wednesday June 18, 2025 as it could undermine the settlement reached between the Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles and the TRANZITO VECTOR shown in the Council's agenda Item #34.

Communication from Public

Name: Don Andres

Date Submitted: 06/17/2025 08:18 PM

Council File No: 22-1154-S1

Comments for Public Posting: I OPPOSE A NEW DIGITAL INTERACTIVE AD KIOSK PROGRAM

Communication from Public

Name: Alan Louis Kishbaugh
Date Submitted: 06/17/2025 08:13 PM
Council File No: 22-1154-S1
Comments for Public Posting: Please reject this item

Communication from Public

Name: Marian Dodge
Date Submitted: 06/17/2025 04:41 PM
Council File No: 22-1154-S1
Comments for Public Posting: RFP for IKE OPPOSE

CF 22-1154-S1

The installation of interactive digital kiosks (IKE) in the public right of way is a disaster waiting to happen. Giant versions of a cell phone will be installed on city sidewalks. They are totally unnecessary; everyone has a phone in his hand and can get all the tourist information he wants. The kiosks will impede ADA access on the sidewalks. They will be a distraction to passing drivers and increase the number of accidents in the area. These kiosks provide nothing but visual blight.

Why is the City considering another advertising program that will be in direct competition for the recently approved STAP program? You are undermining the revenue from STAP. This makes no sense at all. IKE provides no community benefits, no shade or seating for transit riders.

I strongly urge you to vote NO to these giant advertising kiosks.

Marian Dodge

Communication from Public

Name: Jeff Swofford
Date Submitted: 06/17/2025 07:50 PM
Council File No: 22-1154-S1
Comments for Public Posting: I oppose the IKE program

Communication from Public

Name: David S Kadin
Date Submitted: 06/17/2025 07:50 PM
Council File No: 22-1154-S1
Comments for Public Posting: Please support! Thank you,

Communication from Public

Name: Lois Becker on behalf of BASPOA

Date Submitted: 06/17/2025 02:44 PM

Council File No: 22-1154-S1

Comments for Public Posting: Bel Air Skycrest Property Owners' Association (BASPOA) STRONGLY OPPOSES IKE, the Interactive Ad Kiosk Program. Though the 2 programs seem to overlap, IKE is vastly inferior to STAP. If both IKE and STAP pass, IKE will completely undercut all the hard negotiated benefits offered by the STAP Settlement Agreement. This would be a terrible loss for the City and our transit riders. We urge you to OPPOSE IKE.

Communication from Public

Name: Robin Rudisill

Date Submitted: 06/17/2025 10:04 AM

Council File No: 22-1154-S1

Comments for Public Posting: Councilmembers: Please vote no on Agenda item #33, to oppose the release of the RFP for installing digital interactive advertising kiosks in the public right-of-way. This motion was introduced by Councilmember McOsker, a former registered lobbyist for IKE/interactive kiosk program, a proposal to install hundreds of two-sided, giant smartphone-like advertising screens on public sidewalks in neighborhoods across the City. This proposal unnecessary added blight and is unacceptable! The problems with the giant advertising screens include: • Provides no shade and shelter for transit riders; • Provides no discretionary community benefit funds to Council offices; • Takes away from the advertising revenue for STAP, thus preventing the city from building more bus shelters; and • Provides no support for the R.A.I.S.E. program initiatives. The STAP program has the same functionality and is already provided for in your contract with them. Please do not dilute or harm this important city program. Thank you, Robin Rudisill

Communication from Public

Name: Zach Rasmussen

Date Submitted: 06/17/2025 11:26 AM

Council File No: 22-1154-S1

Comments for Public Posting: Hello, I am writing today in SUPPORT of the STAP program settlement reached between Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles & Tranzito Vector, Item #34 (Council File 20-1536). The recent upgrades at the Transit bus stops for its riders was long overdue. It not only provides the necessary shade in our desert climate but it also shows that our tax dollars are actually serving a purpose. As a blue-collar worker for nearly two decades in this city our infrastructure needs serious upgrades and this is a step in the right direction. I am also writing to REJECT a new digital interactive AD kiosk program that undermined the viability of the STAP program & threatens shade & shelter for Transit riders. Item #33 (Council File 22-1154-S1). Selling out for advertising money instead of investing into the hard working individuals whom make this city operate is a slap in all of our faces. With trying to support their families in one of the highest cost of living cities in America the least we can do is provide them the necessary protection while they are waiting to simply go to & from work on public transportation. Lets invest back into our city instead of patting the pockets of corruption. Do the right thing!

Communication from Public

Name: Zach Rasmussen

Date Submitted: 06/17/2025 11:28 AM

Council File No: 22-1154-S1

Comments for Public Posting: Hello, I am writing to REJECT a new digital interactive AD kiosk program that undermined the viability of the STAP program & threatens shade & shelter for Transit riders. Item #33 (Council File 22-1154-S1). Selling out for advertising money instead of investing into the hard working individuals whom make this city operate is a slap in all of our faces. With trying to support their families in one of the highest cost of living cities in America the least we can do is provide them the necessary protection while they are waiting to simply go to & from work on public transportation. Lets invest back into our city instead of patting the pockets of corruption. Do the right thing!