

**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>

Wed, Sep 21, 2022 at 8:45 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: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:19:03 -0700
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Pamela Gibberman** <pgibberman@gmail.com>
 Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 11:37 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,
 Pamela Gibberman
 9209 Kester Ave
 Panorama City, CA 91402

----- 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: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:19:15 -0700
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Marika Sung** <marikasung@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 11:53 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,
 Marika Sung
 6208 Warner dr
 LA, 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: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:18:45 -0700
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Dennis Trembly** <trembly@usc.edu>
 Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 11:08 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,
Dennis Trembly
27616 Longhill Dr
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

----- 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: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:18:29 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **G. Saffren** <gsaffren@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 11:05 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,
G. Saffren
2100 Malcolm Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90025

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>
Cc:
Bcc:
Date: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:18:15 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Susan Requa** <srequa@gmail.com>
 Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 10:50 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 Requa
 4339 3rd Ave
 Los Angeles, CA 90008

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>
 To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>
 Cc:
 Bcc:
 Date: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:18:04 -0700
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Janet Reichmann** <jreichmann@comstockhills.com>
 Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 10:48 PM
 Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2
 To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

Billboard Ordinance/ Sign Regulations: It appears that one of the main reasons the City is pushing STAP is to revise the LAMC to remove current

protections against advertising structures on the PUBLIC right-of-way and to allow all manners of commercial advertising structures without limit. The City claims to be helping transit riders, but it appears the true motivation for the program is to facilitate the generation of advertising revenues.

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

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

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

Sincerely,
Janet Reichmann
1429 Comstock Ave.
Los, 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: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:17:32 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Mary Glazer** <hlpmary@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 10:30 PM
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,
Mary Glazer
4922 Range View Ave
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: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:17:47 -0700
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **mary robinson** <maryrobinson0266@sbcglobal.net>
 Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 10:40 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 robinson
 woodrow wilson
 la, CA 90046

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>
 To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>
 Cc:
 Bcc:
 Date: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:17:19 -0700
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Mel Marcus** <earthmamamel@hotmail.com>
 Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 9:51 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,
Mel Marcus
5718 e scrivener st
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: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:17:03 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Cordi Koga** <stradsrus@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 9:45 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,
Cordi Koga
29403 Stonecrest Rd
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

----- 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: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:16:23 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **A.L. Watts** <agneswatts@shaw.ca>
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 9:30 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,
A.L. Watts
1712 Winmar 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: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:16:02 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Elana Buegoff** <ebuegoff@netzeto.net>
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 9:25 PM
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

Cost: The CAO's report makes clear that there are actually no revenue guarantees, and yet the City will be required to spend over \$230 million to launch STAP. This is fiscally irresponsible. Costs and revenues are uncertain. The City has taken on the fiscal responsibility and duty to implement vast elements

of the program (as well as the public automated toilet program for which there have not been sufficient funds identified).

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,
Elana Buegoff
6506 Hayes Dr
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: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:15:46 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Patricia Mace** <patriciamace@ca.rr.com>
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 9:20 PM
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

To whom it may concern:

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

Safety: 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: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>
Cc:
Bcc:
Date: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:15:21 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Norman Goss** <gossnje@earthlink.net>
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 9:15 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,
Norman Goss
1200 Valley View Rd #308
Glendale, CA 91202

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>
Cc:
Bcc:
Date: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:15:05 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Ruth Doxsee** <ruthdoxsee@sbcglobal.net>
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 9:03 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,
Ruth Doxsee
17128 Baltar Street
Van Nuys, CA 91406

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>
Cc:
Bcc:
Date: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:14:53 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Julia Keplinger** <julia.keplinger@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 9:00 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,
Julia Keplinger
1649 S Hobart Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90006

----- 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: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:14:38 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Brad Kane** <bkane@kanelaw.la>
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 8:58 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,
Brad Kane
1154 S Crescent Heights Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90035

----- 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: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:14:26 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Carrie Henderson** <studiohenderson2@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 8:56 PM
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,
Carrie Henderson
4003 Goodland Ave
Studio City, CA 91604

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <cityclerk@lacity.org>
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>
Cc:
Bcc:
Date: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:13:52 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Olivia Dibs** <olivia.dibs@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 8:55 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,
Olivia Dibs
9824 Hillhaven Ave
Tujunga, CA 91042

----- 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: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:13:40 -0700
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **sharon byers** <sibyers@gmail.com>
 Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 8:54 PM
 Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2
 To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,
 sharon byers
 13042 Stanbridge Ave
 Downey, CA 90242

----- 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: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:13:04 -0700
 Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Sheila Winston** <sheshe@mybunnyday.com>
 Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 8:22 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,
Sheila Winston
24303 Woolsey Cyn Road
West Hills, CA 91304

----- 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: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:12:51 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Jeff Gould** <jeffdgould@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 8:12 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,
Jeff Gould
220 W 5th St
Los Angeles, CA 90013

----- 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: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:12:28 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Felicia Chase** <beadlmnia@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 8:04 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,
Felicia Chase
16027 Ventura Blvd Ste 200
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: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:10:01 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Karen Ridgley** <karenridgley4ppcc@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 7:17 PM
Subject: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@lacity.org>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

Privacy: The City does not appear to understand the threat to personal privacy posed by wireless devices collecting cell phone data from passersby. The City claims that only "anonymous" data will be collected, but does not explain how it will verify this when a private company will actually be operating the

system. Anonymous" data can be used to target individuals through re-identification, a practice commonly used by data brokers.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,
Karen Ridgley
16128 Northfield St
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: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:09:38 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Joyce Wilber** <jwilbertheboss7@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 6:53 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,

Joyce Wilber
9237 La Salle Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90047

----- 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: Wed, 21 Sep 2022 08:09:19 -0700
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2

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

From: **Arthur Delgadillo** <gloriaferro414@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 6:46 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,
Arthur Delgadillo
713 N Loma Vista Dr
Long Beach, CA 90813

...

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

28 attachments

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

-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**
10K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**
13K
-  **Fwd: Public Comments on CF 20-1536 and CF 20-1536-S2.eml**
13K