



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

**09/19/2022**

1 message

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

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](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
 Marika Sung  
 6208 Warner dr  
 LA, CA 90048

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <[cityclerk@lacity.org](mailto:cityclerk@lacity.org)>  
 To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <[clerk.cps@lacity.org](mailto:clerk.cps@lacity.org)>  
 Cc:  
 Bcc:  
 Date: 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](mailto: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](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
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](mailto: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](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
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](mailto: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](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Susan Requa  
4339 3rd Ave  
Los Angeles, CA 90008

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

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

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: 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](mailto: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](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Janet 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** <hlpmaryg@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](mailto: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](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
 mary robinson  
 woodrow wilson  
 la, CA 90046

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <[cityclerk@lacity.org](mailto:cityclerk@lacity.org)>  
 To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <[clerk.cps@lacity.org](mailto:clerk.cps@lacity.org)>  
 Cc:  
 Bcc:  
 Date: 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](mailto: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](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
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](mailto: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](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Norman Goss  
1200 Valley View Rd #308  
Glendale, CA 91202

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

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

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

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: 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](mailto: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](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Ruth Dorse  
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](mailto: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](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Brad Kane  
1154 S Crescent Heights Blvd.  
Los Angeles, CA 90035

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

From: Office of the City Clerk <[cityclerk@lacity.org](mailto:cityclerk@lacity.org)>  
To: City Clerk Council and Public Services <[clerk.cps@lacity.org](mailto:clerk.cps@lacity.org)>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: 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](mailto: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](mailto:CityClerk@lacity.org)>

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
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