

Communication from Public

Name: Adriana De La Cruz
Date Submitted: 08/23/2022 04:18 PM
Council File No: 20-1536

Comments for Public Posting: Wednesday, AUG 24, 2022 - public hearing Dear Committee Member, Although I am the Area D Director for the Del Rey Neighborhood council, I am speaking as an individual in this email to you. Firstly, let me express my thanks for your service to the community. Secondly, I would like to provide public commentary for the upcoming joint public works meeting tomorrow. The agenda item is the Sidewalk and Transit Amenities Program (STAP). For years now I have seen the efforts each City Department has made since the pandemic in striving for delivery of quality service within a restrictive budget. The unforeseen circumstances leading to a work stoppage, followed by a budget cut has put a stalwart in completion of projects listed in March of 2020 and beyond. At the moment, with limited crews and funding, the Sidewalk and Transit Amenities Program has gone through longer restricting than usual by my estimation. I am mindful that any project as seasoned at the STAP Program, has been overdue for a in depth review and upgrade. The team that has been keeping my area updated regarding the program, has made many visits to each Alliance and Neighborhood Council in an effort to inform the public of necessary changes. From a neutral perspective, I believe that the program report submitted to you by the BPW is reasonable in its requests. The years in the making was well worth it to be able to its continued and foreseeable success for decades to come. Let me commend, Lance Oishi, Contract Administrator for the Bureau of Street Services (BSS) and his support staff in their communications to the various groups. Although, BSS Director Adel Hagekhalil has moved on, Greg Spotts his Assistant Director has been very supportive in facilitating a variety of presentations on the program by his staffers at various community meetings since revamping the Program. I encourage you to be just as supportive of the much needed change that is necessary to get the program more in line with our current circumstances. Self sustaining programs are essential so that much needed tax proceeds can be utilized in other areas that need urgent attention, such as road resurfacing and street maintenance and repair. There will be others speaking against, I am well aware of this as I have heard a myriad of apprehension. What I wish to point out is that the majority of input city-wide is in favor of this report. That being said, please allow this to move on to completion so work can begin and allow for more immediate focus on the financing and approval of additional essential services. Finally, please realize that ongoing reports regarding this program were given to the Stakeholder Advisory committee organized by the Bureau of Street Services, so those stakeholder Advisors could relay the happenings to their respective organizations they represented, which continued to benefit the community and Los Angeles City stakeholders. I am more than confident that the Department will continue to be available to inquiries or concerns from other neighbors

regarding the program in order to come to a mutual beneficial consensus even after the revised program relaunches. Thank you for your time and consideration, Adriana De La Cruz Sidewalk and Transit Amenities Program (STAP) Dear Stakeholder, We are emailing to let you know that on August 24, 2022 at 2:15pm, there will be a public hearing of the Joint Public Works and Budget & Finance Committees of the Los Angeles City Council for the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND), and the City Administrative Officer (CAO) and Board of Public Works (BPW) reports for the Sidewalk and Transit Amenities Program (STAP). For the agenda and links to the reports, please visit:
<https://lacity.primegov.com/Portal/Meeting?meetingTemplateId=106840>
Thank you

Communication from Public

Name: Christina Spitz

Date Submitted: 08/24/2022 08:04 AM

Council File No: 20-1536

Comments for Public Posting: Please see the attached communication -- OPPOSE approval of proposed amendments to LAMC Secs. 67-01 and 67-02. Thank you. Christina Spitz

August 24, 2022

From: Christina Spitz

To: Hon. Eric Garcetti, Mayor, City of Los Angeles; Hon. Bob Blumenfield, Chair, Public Works Cmte (PWC); Hon. Paul Krekorian, Chair, Budget & Finance Cmte (BFC); Hon. members of the PWC and BFC

cc: Matt Szabo, City Administrative Officer; Ted Jordan, Assistant City Attorney; Hon. Mike Bonin, CD11

Re: CF 20-1536, CF 20-1536-S1 and 20-1536-S2 – OPPOSE approval of MND for the STAP program, contract and proposed amendment of LAMC Secs. 67.01 & 67.02; OPPOSE proposed amendment of LAMC Secs. 67.01 & 67.02.

I write in my individual capacity as a citizen of Los Angeles, residing in Pacific Palisades. For identification purposes only, I am Vice-Chair of the Westside Regional Alliance of Councils (WRAC), a coalition of all 14 neighborhood and community councils in the Westside of Los Angeles. I am also immediate past Secretary of Pacific Palisades Community Council (PPCC) and a former Chair of PPCC.

I strongly oppose approval of the MND for the STAP program, contract and proposed amendment of LAMC Secs. 67.01 & 67.02 and urge that a full EIR be conducted prior to any approval, as does PPCC. See:

<https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/PPCC-EC-Letter-STAP-MND.pdf>. I also strongly oppose the proposed amendment of LAMC Secs. 67.01 & 67.02, as does PPCC, without at least a specific exception for Scenic Highways (those as to which Scenic Corridor Plans have not been adopted), including without limitation Sunset Blvd. See: <https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/PPCC-Letter-CF-20-1536-S1.pdf>.

Moreover, I fully support the positions taken by both WRAC and PPCC, calling for Scenic Highway, Coastal Zone, Community Plan and Specific Plan protections in connection with the STAP program. See: https://clkrep.lacity.org/online/docs/2020/20-1536_PC_AB_02-05-2021.pdf.

It is imperative to note that the original motion in CF 20-1536, by Councilmembers Blumenfield and Bonin, ***specifically called for parameters of the program “to ensure compatibility with . . . land use zones such as specific plans and scenic highways.”*** The motion itself did not call for amendment of LAMC Secs. 67.01 or 67.02 to allow expanded advertising in the PROW – and in fact, ***none of the WRAC member councils which are listed on the meeting agenda as being in support of the Council File ever submitted a CIS in support of such amendments.***

Indeed, WRAC members Bel Air Beverly Crest NC, Brentwood CC, Del Rey NC, Mar Vista CC, PPCC, West LA-Sawtelle NC, Westside NC and Westwood NC all support the position adopted by WRAC, as set forth above (including, among other things, calling for Scenic Highway, Community Plan, Specific Plan and Coastal Zone Protections, but ***not*** for expanded advertising in the PROW).

As explained more fully in the PPCC letter of May 26, 2022 (linked above), **the proposed amendments to LAMC secs. 67.01 & 67.02 would violate the Mobility Element of the General Plan** (which prohibits commercial advertising in the PROW within 500 ft. of the centerline of Scenic Highways as to which Scenic Corridor Plans have not been adopted). Again, I respectfully urge members of the PWC and BFC to disapprove the proposed amendments without at least an express exception for all such Scenic Highways, including without limitation Sunset Blvd.

Thank you for your consideration.

Christina Spitz

Submitted for filing via the City Clerk public comment portal

Communication from Public

Name: Diana Nave, Chair Planning and Land Use Committee, Northwest San Pedro Neighborhood Council

Date Submitted: 08/24/2022 08:46 AM

Council File No: 20-1536

Comments for Public Posting: Although the Northwest San Pedro Neighborhood Council previously submitted a CIS stating that the Council would support this motion if amended, the requested amendments were not made. This should now be taken as a position of opposition. The following language was part of our CIS We are very concerned about the safety and aesthetic impacts of digital advertising screens in bus shelters. Studies have shown that changing digital ad screens are particularly dangerous as they are designed to distract drivers and result in reduced traffic safety. Even worse than freeway digital billboards, these displays would cause distraction not only for cars but also pedestrians, inherently increasing the potential for unsafe vehicle-pedestrian interaction. In an environment where mobile phone distracted drivers are causing increased pedestrian injury we find it reckless to add yet another accident vector. We adamantly oppose provisions for cell phone tracking in the shelters. This data can be shared with the contractor for ad targeting, and we have no assurance that the data will be safely kept by the City. This practice also violates Europe's GDPR, which applies to EU citizens when outside the EU: <https://gdpr.eu/companies-outside-of-europe/> . Therefore, before any new bus shelters are installed in our neighborhood, we request a full Environmental Impact Report that considers safety, power usage, and aesthetics. Any contract that is eventually negotiated by the City needs to respect and abide by any Community Plan, Specific Plan, Scenic Highway and Coastal Zone protections and requirements, and address constituents' concerns about preservation of community character, protection of residential neighborhoods, and local street furniture preferences. Although we are opposed to all digital signs, if they are allowed, the City should restrict digital signs in or near bus shelters to sign districts in the 22 areas already zoned as Regional Commercial for high-intensity commercial use and comply with all future rules regarding digital billboards and they should be placed to face away from the oncoming traffic. A policy governing data collection, ownership, privacy, and use from devices placed within public rights-of-way or on City facilities should be developed and shared for community/neighborhood council input. Audio coming from the billboards should be prohibited. A

process for ongoing local community input should be included. There must be triggers that allow the City the ability to break the contract if terms are not met. The City and its communities should not have to live with poorly kept shelters.

Communication from Public

Name: Casey Maddren, Citizens for a Better Los Angeles
Date Submitted: 08/24/2022 08:50 AM
Council File No: 20-1536
Comments for Public Posting: Citizens for a Better Los Angeles submits the attached comments on the Sidewalk & Transit Amenities Program, and urges the City Council to reject the program on the grounds that it involves serious violations of privacy laws and could subject the City to significant liability.

August 24, 2022

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

Re: Sidewalk Transit Amenities Program (STAP), MND, MMP, Tranzito-Vector
Contract and Related Ordinance
Council Files: 20-1536, 20-1536-S1, 20-1536-S2
STRONGLY OPPOSED

Members of the Los Angeles City Council,

Citizens for a Better Los Angeles (CBLA) is a nonprofit public benefit corporation organized to serve all the people in all cities and unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. CBLA's mission is to: defend the rights of all people; work to ensure that all people's basic needs are met; work to protect the environment, and raise awareness of the many threats to the environment; ensure that public officials and others in positions of power are held accountable for their actions.

CBLA is writing to voice its strong opposition to the approval of the Sidewalk and Transit Amenities Program (STAP), as well as the related Ordinance, Tranzito-Vector Contract, MND and MMP. As this process moves forward, it has become clear that this entire program, repeatedly described as a way to deliver amenities to transit riders, is in fact an effort to do away with regulations that govern advertising in the public right of way and to pave the way for the collection of data on a massive scale.

There are many reasons to be concerned about STAP, but CBLA believes privacy issues are especially troubling. The City is allowing a private company to collect personal data from citizens' cell phones with no meaningful protections in place. City staff and consultants involved with the program have given inaccurate and misleading answers to questions about privacy concerns. The City claims it will protect citizens' privacy, but has failed to articulate what those protections are and how the City will ensure their efficacy. These concerns seem especially important given the recent revelation that data broker Lexis Nexis has been selling personal data to ICE and other government agencies.

Data Broker LexisNexis Sued for Helping ICE Target Immigrant Communities
https://www.democracynow.org/2022/8/19/immigrant_rights_groups_sue_data_broker

It is illegal to collect personal data from citizens without their consent, and the City of LA is apparently oblivious to serious liability issues that will almost certainly arise from the approval of the STAP as currently constituted.

We urge you to reject this program.

Casey Maddren
Citizens for a Better Los Angeles
2141 Cahuenga Blvd., Apt. 17
Los Angeles, CA 90068
cblacontact@gmail.com