

October 6, 2015

Office of the Chief Legislative Analyst
200 N. Spring Street, Room 255
Los Angeles, CA 90012
ATTN: Felipe Chavez

RE: Recommendations for a citywide permit program for sidewalk vending in Los Angeles.

Dear Mr. Chavez:

The Los Angeles Street Vendor Campaign (LASVC) writes in response to the Chief Legislative Analyst's request for input and recommendations concerning the creation of a policy framework for sidewalk vending in the City of Los Angeles.

The LASVC is a coalition of 57 organizations representing street vendor, community economic development, immigrant rights, public health, food equity, safe and vibrant streets, and business perspectives. The LASVC and its supporters strongly recommend creating a citywide permit program to allow regulated vending on city sidewalks and in city parks. A comprehensive, citywide permit system will foster entrepreneurship, activate the City's sidewalks, increase public safety by having more eyes on our streets, create jobs (particularly for those with barriers to employment), increase healthy food access in communities with limited food options, and allow for significant contributions to the local economy. And for tens of thousands of working Angelenos, a citywide program of formalized vending presents an opportunity to practice a trade and build a business without fear of arrest or criminal penalties.

The Office of the Chief Legislative Analyst (CLA) has issued a request for feedback on proposed parameters for a sidewalk vending program. At six public hearings held in May through August of 2015, the CLA presented three policy scenarios and a menu of program components for what could make a permitted sidewalk vending program work for Los Angeles. The LASVC, its supporters, hundreds of individual vendors, and numerous other community stakeholders attended these meetings and provided testimony to recommend the creation of a meaningful and inclusive path towards formalization. Overall, the public comment portion of each of these meetings reflected *overwhelming* public support – from all regions of the city and all sectors of the economy – for the legalization of sidewalk vending. However, with limited time for verbal comments during the meetings, we appreciate this opportunity to now follow up in writing with more detailed and consolidated policy recommendations.

Part I of this letter provides a response to each of the three policy models presented by the CLA, explains our strong support for Model 2, and contributes specific policy details concerning implementation and enforcement. Part II provides recommendations regarding enforcement and budgetary considerations. Part III provides our response to the BSS sample sidewalk placement restrictions and includes detailed recommendations for commonsense sidewalk safety rules, which we believe to be a cornerstone of an effective citywide program. Finally, attached to this letter is a copy of the LASVC model ordinance language, organized to match the core elements of the CLA's Framework document that was approved by the City Council Economic Development Committee in 2014. Our recommendations are the result of a long iterative process incorporating the input of hundreds of vendors and stakeholders. We sincerely hope that you will take these recommendations into consideration as you complete your final report to the Economic Development Committee.

I. The City should enact and implement a citywide vending permit program (Model 2).

The CLA presented three potential policy models to govern sidewalk vending: Model 1 calls for maintaining the existing criminal ban on sidewalk vending with increased enforcement. Model 2 proposes a citywide program to permit and regulate sidewalk vending. Model 3 suggests a patchwork approach that allows some neighborhoods to propose vending districts for approval by the City Council and otherwise maintains a criminal ban on vending across the city.

We urge the CLA to recommend a citywide vending permit program consistent with Model 2. This approach avoids the many shortcomings and proven negative consequences associated with models 1 and 3, and would allow street vendors to pursue their livelihood legitimately while protecting public health and safety, managing congestion, and generating revenue. Below, we outline our critiques of Models 1 and 3. We also recommend specific policy details for Model 2, to ensure accessible and inclusive permitting practices, sidewalk safety, reasonable enforcement, and healthy food incentives.

Model 1 does not address the many problems of the status quo and misses a valuable opportunity to invigorate the culture and economy of Los Angeles.

Model 1 would continue a complete criminal ban on vending with increased enforcement. This approach does not address *any* of the problems with the status quo, exacerbates the injustice suffered by vendors, and increases the enforcement cost to the City. In short, Model 1 is bad for the City's budget, bad for the regional economy, and bad for the people who live and work in Los Angeles.

Model 1 neglects the present opportunity for the city to reduce its enforcement burden, increase revenue, and improve the economy and street life. Widely permitted vending will create jobs for low-income residents, alleviate poverty, and help prevent homelessness. According to one recent report, sidewalk vending in Los Angeles generates hundreds of millions of dollars in economic activity, provides tens of thousands of jobs for Angelenos, and offers tens of millions of dollars in potential tax revenue.¹ But instead of supporting this burgeoning economy, Model 1 would dramatically increase costs to the city by adding BSS inspectors without any corresponding permit system to bring in revenue. Model 1 would result only in a net drain on city resources.

Model 1 would also unnecessarily increase confrontations and conflict between police and community members. Currently, vendors are issued costly tickets leading to onerous criminal justice debt, including bench warrants and civil assessments for failure-to-appear or failure-to-pay. Some vendors are arrested and incarcerated. Property seizure by police, BSS employees, county public health workers, and private security forces deprive vendors of their property without due process and stoke animosity between the community and public employees. Maintaining a complete prohibition on sidewalk vending will only perpetuate unjust criminalization of poverty, and further relegate thousands of low-wage workers to the underground economy. We should strive to disassemble, not fortify, unjust barriers to opportunity.

Model 1 would also completely deprive all Angelenos of the many benefits of regulated sidewalk vending. Vendors can make Los Angeles a healthier city by selling fruits and vegetables in neighborhoods that lack adequate access to healthy food. Having convenient food and merchandise available on the streets will invigorate Los Angeles street life, encourage pedestrian activity and make our public spaces livelier, safer and more enjoyable.² Vendors can activate commercial corridors, draw foot traffic to small business districts, provide "eyes on the street," and make sidewalks more inviting by providing

¹ Available at <http://economicrt.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/LA-Street-Vendor-Report-final-6-22-2015.pdf>

² Street vending will further the City's goal of having "complete streets." "The idea behind complete streets is to make streets safe, comfortable, and convenient for people of all mode types." Mobility Plan 2035, page 63.

refreshment to pedestrians. Sidewalk vending also promotes the use of public transit. A snack or cold beverage will transform a tedious wait for the bus into a pleasant moment to relax and enjoy the company of fellow riders. In many neighborhoods, vendors provide culturally significant products and help sustain cultural traditions and connections. Model 1 would further rob us of these benefits and would cause Los Angeles to remain the unfortunate outlier among major cities that recognize the immense value of regulated sidewalk vending.

Formalized vending also advances the key policy initiatives of the City's General Plan. For example, vending promotes the Mobility Plan's directive to "expand the role of the street as a public space."³ The Health Element expressly encourages a "clear pathway for the legalization of street (sidewalk) vending to support viable economic opportunities for entrepreneurs and to increase access to healthy food in underserved neighborhoods."⁴ By perpetuating a criminal ban on vending and increasing the criminalization of vendors, Model 1 is patently inconsistent with City policy.

Finally, it is inaccurate to suggest that Model 1 would include any option for legalized sidewalk vending. The code provision allowing the creation of isolated vending districts, LAMC 42.00(m), has proven to be a failure and is now "dead letter law."⁵ The only district ever created under 42.00(m) was in MacArthur Park, and it has been defunct for many years. This district failed in large part because of onerous regulations and bureaucratic overhead. Rules about what vendors could sell, and where they could sell it, undermined the flexibility important to the street vending craft.⁶ These restrictions stifled the natural flexibility and responsiveness that allows vendors to sell things that people need, at affordable prices, in places convenient for customers. The failure of the MacArthur Park vending district demonstrates the importance of adopting citywide regulations instead of limited districts.

Model 2 offers the best approach for effectively formalizing vending and stimulating the Los Angeles economy.

The CLA should recommend a citywide vending program consistent with Model 2. A citywide permit system is not the same as blanket legalization or an unregulated free-for-all. In fact, a citywide program that regulates for sidewalk safety is the most efficient and targeted way to address the various concerns about the vending economy.

A standard set of rules will provide clarity for vendors, residents, brick-and-mortar businesses and enforcement agencies, thereby reducing administrative costs. Moreover, a citywide permit system distributes vending opportunities more widely, which encourages greater participation. This greater participation in turn maximizes the reach and effect of important rules and regulations concerning food safety, sidewalk accessibility, debris, liability insurance, taxes, and enforcement. Conversely, we know that limiting the number of vendors or confining the trade to designated zones will only discourage or impede compliance, bringing about the very ills that regulation is intended to address. This is not mere speculation. We have seen these effects in other cities, and in our own backyard when LA's previous attempt at vending districts failed. Let's not repeat the mistakes of the past. Los Angeles deserves a system that works. Los Angeles needs a citywide permit system.

³ Mobility Plan 2035, page 14.

⁴ Plan for a Healthy LA, Implementation Program 45. See also, Policies 4.4 and 4.8, supporting the legalization of sidewalk vending as a strategy to improve healthy food access and food innovation.

⁵ Section 42.00(m) requires that petitions to create new vending districts be submitted to the Community Development Department, but this department no longer exists. Despite tens of thousands of vendors who want to work legally, no vending districts are operational.

⁶ Kettles, Gregg W. 2004. "Regulating Vending in the Sidewalk Commons." Temple Law Review. Vol 77, No. 1, 2004. http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=897498

Based on rigorous community outreach and engagement with hundreds of vendors, small businesses and stakeholders, we strongly recommend the following policy details to ensure that a citywide permit system is effective, responsive to concerns, and workable for all stakeholders:

Enable permitted vending on sidewalks and in parks. A vending ordinance should permit vending both on sidewalks and in parks. The City Council recently adopted an ordinance prohibiting vending in parks, after the previous park ordinance remained suspended for nearly ten years. The amended ordinance expressly anticipates a regime of permitted vending, allowing the City to “issue a license, permit, or contract ... to vend ... in a park.”⁷ However, this reference to permitted vending is meaningless as long as the City fails to offer a process for vendors to obtain permits to vend in in park. On June 16, Councilmember Price initiated a motion directing the Department of Recreation and Parks to “work with the CLA on the citywide effort to address regulation of street vending” and develop a compatible process for vending in parks.⁸ Allowing vending in parks, as well as on sidewalks, is important to improving the vibrancy of our parks and expanding economic opportunities.

Ensure safety and accessibility with commonsense sidewalk placement restrictions, but DO NOT confine vending to zones or districts or establish areas where vendors are categorically excluded. Any vending program must prioritize public safety and ensure sidewalk accessibility. The most effective and efficient way to achieve these policy objectives is through clear, commonsense rules governing the space and location of sidewalk placement. We recommend a set of regulations that: maintain a minimum amount of clear sidewalk space at all times; adhere to ADA standards; prohibit vending near crosswalks, curbs and fire hydrants/emergency facilities; and prevent vending operations or patrons from blocking the entrances to shops, restaurants, and other businesses. County certified food carts will also be required to identify access to a bathroom with a signed letter from a nearby brick and mortar business.

The application of these rules within a citywide permit system would actually create a *de facto cap* on the number of vending operations on any given street, effectively filtering vending out and preventing overconcentration and unsafe obstructions. But it is the narrowly tailored, *street-level application* of the rules that enable a more nimble system to better match the variations in streetscapes across our city. It would be misguided to think that simply establishing vending zones or districts would achieve the same results. The district approach has proven to impede full participation and compliance, leading to costly enforcement, lost economic opportunity, and ineffective regulations. Instead, pairing a *citywide* application with targeted sidewalk placement guidelines is the best way to distribute opportunities, incite greater participation and maximize compliance with important safety provisions.

Create an accessible and easy-to-navigate permit application process. Permits should be available for both food vending and merchandise vending. To discourage unpermitted vending and minimize enforcement cost, the permit process should be inclusive and easy to navigate, with appropriate language access, and no inquiry into immigration or citizenship status. The permit fees, which should be affordable for current vendors, should support administration without inhibiting participation. There should be no arbitrary cap on the total number of permits issued. This will encourage as many vendors as possible to obtain permits, reducing enforcement burden and maximizing revenue and employment created by the newly formalized street vending economy.

⁷ LAMC 63.44(A)(g).

⁸ See Council File 13-1493-S2.

Impose meaningful rules to protect public health and safety. We recommend that any applicant proposing to vend food items be required to obtain the necessary County Health Permit and proof of commissary usage prior to receiving a permit from the City. Rules should unequivocally prohibit merchandise vendors from selling pirated or counterfeit merchandise. A state seller's permit, and City business tax registration should be required. We also support a requirement that vendors obtain general liability insurance.

Provide meaningful incentives for healthy food vending. Vendors should be encouraged to sell fresh fruit, produce, water, and healthy snacks. "Healthy Food Vendors" should be granted incentives such as reduced permit fees, special access to events sponsored by the City, and exclusive preferential vending areas, such as locations closer to schools, in front of hospitals, and in designated Healthy Food Corners. These incentives will allow the City to leverage the mobility of street vendors to improve the health of communities.

Assist community-based organizations to provide technical assistance, education, financial support, and other capacity building services to vendors. Technical assistance will help vendors comply with regulations, increasing revenue from permit fees and sales tax, and decreasing the cost of enforcement. The City should prioritize effective technical assistance to bring existing vendors into compliance and make the citywide vending program a success.

Consider permit exemptions for small-scale vendors. Vendors who are not selling products that require a public health permit, with very small operations (having a length less than 4 foot and a width less than 3 foot), and whose revenue is less than \$900 per year should be eligible for a waived permit requirement, or waived permit fee from the City. This small exemption could save considerable enforcement costs for the City, while easing the burden on vendors whose incomes might make an annual permit prohibitively costly. These small vending operations with permit or fee exemptions should be required to comply with all other rules concerning sidewalk safety.

Implement a responsible and humane enforcement strategy. Encouraging compliance is critical to the success of any new program for sidewalk vending. The citywide sidewalk vending program should include a tiered compliance regime, beginning with warnings and resource referrals, followed by reasonable fines for subsequent violations. All violations should be treated either as a warning or as an infraction. No violation should result in a misdemeanor or be subject to the Administration Citation Enforcement (ACE) program. Suspension of a permit should occur after 4 violations in one year, with an opportunity to appeal. The Citywide Sidewalk Vending Program should include a phased-in compliance program to accommodate a period of public education about the new regulations and requirements. Fines should be established with the recognition that the amount a vendor will ultimately pay for an infraction includes substantial fees equal to *several times the base fine amount.*⁹

⁹Courts often issue a fine of \$50 for violating the current street vending ban. After fees are added, a vendor will owe \$306 from this base fine of \$50. If the city believes, for example, that an appropriate punishment for violating a vending regulation is about \$162, then the base fine should be \$20. See Government Code §70373 (adding a thirty-five dollar criminal conviction assessment); Penal Code §1465.7 (applying a 20% criminal surcharge fee); Government Code §76000 (assessing seven dollars of every ten dollars, or part of ten dollars, upon every fine for the County Penalty Fund); Government Code §70372a (assessing three dollars of every ten dollars, or part of ten dollars, upon every fine for the State Court Facilities Construction Fund); Penal Code §1464 (assessing ten dollars of every ten dollars, or part of ten dollars, upon every fine for the State Penalty Fund); Government Code §70372 (assessing two dollars of every ten dollars, or part of ten dollars, upon every fine for the State Immediate and Critical Needs Account); Government Code §76104.7 (assessing four dollars of every ten dollars, or part of ten dollars, upon every fine for the State DNA Identification Fund); Government Code §76104.6 (assessing one dollar

As presented, Model 3 would lead to exclusionary policies, undermine regulatory efforts, and is fundamentally no different than LAMC 42.00(m).

While a “community driven” model may have rhetorical appeal, Model 3 actually has many dangerous pitfalls and could too easily devolve into an unjust tool of exclusion. The CLA should not recommend, and the City should not adopt, a policy that allows any group to exclude vendors outright. This is counter to the purpose and spirit of a vending program, and would send a clear signal that the City continues to delegitimize vending within the small business economy. The key to a successful vending program is inclusion and participation, not exclusion.

Under Model 3, areas that don’t create vending districts will likely continue to experience unpermitted and unregulated vending because of a lack of opportunities across the city. And with a potential patchwork of different vending regulations applied inconsistently across neighborhoods, enforcement and implementation would be costly and administratively burdensome. Model 3 also provides no clarity or applicability to the issue of vending in city parks, making this proposal unresponsive to City Council direction.

We also note that Model 3 is functionally no different than Model 1. The failed vending district program created under 42.00(m) is technically a “community driven” opt-in model. But as discussed above, the bureaucratic overhead involved in creating a vending district has proven too cumbersome to allow any real system of vending districts to succeed. In light of the failure of Section 42.00(m), the Model 3 approach should not be considered. A program that maintains a citywide ban on vending while placing the onus on an undefined “community” to overcome significant procedural hurdles only to create a severely confined vending district is nothing more than a repackaging of a failed policy. Our City should not be satisfied with repeating mistakes, and the CLA should not recommend consideration of something that has already proven ineffective.

II. BSS staffing levels should not be increased prematurely. The City should focus on creating an effective permit system to increase compliance and reduce the need for punitive enforcement.

The CLA has also requested input on possible enforcement models. Specifically, the BSS submitted budgetary estimates for 5, 9, or 17 new “street service investigator” employees, with a cost to the city of approximately \$100,000 per additional investigator. The public was then asked to respond with preferred levels of enforcement.

We understand that compliance is key to a successful vending program. However, it may be premature at this stage to determine the exact need for additional BSS investigators. Instead, the CLA should consider and recommend a flexible formula that accounts for the actual number of sidewalk vending permits issued by the City to determine the appropriate staffing level. In the initial roll out, the City should concentrate on streamlining the permit program by making the application process affordable and providing effective outreach and education efforts for vendors. Creating a working system for lawful vending will significantly decrease the amount of illegal vending, which will in turn reduce the

of every ten dollars, or part of ten dollars, upon every fine for the County DNA Identification Fund); Government Code §76104.7 (assessing two dollars of every ten dollars, or part of ten dollars, upon every fine for the County Maddy Emergency Medical Services Fund); Penal Code §1465.8 (applying a forty dollar “Court operations assessment” per conviction); Government Code §76000.10 (assessing a four dollar fee for the Emergency Medical Air Transportation Act Fund).

enforcement burden on BSS. We recommend that BSS initially hire five or fewer new investigators, concentrate on creating an efficient and inclusive permit system, and then peg any future staffing levels to the actual number of licensed vendors and the demonstrated need (if any) for additional compliance.

The City can minimize compliance costs by creating a permitting process that is streamlined, affordable, and inclusive. By issuing permits to as many vendors as possible within the rules, the City will reduce the costs associated with ticketing vendors without permits. We recognize the need for an appropriate compliance strategy, but urge the CLA and the City Council to consider an inclusive and accessible permit program to part and parcel of a comprehensive enforcement strategy.

III. A set of commonsense sidewalk placement restrictions will protect sidewalk safety and enable a citywide program without arbitrarily limiting vending by unnecessary zones or districts.

We recommend commonsense sidewalk placement restrictions to ensure safety and avoid congestion. As discussed above, effective sidewalk placement rules, when applied citywide, will enable the City to achieve the primary objectives of this program: to promote opportunities for vendors while protecting public safety and activating the streetscape.

Unfortunately, the “Sample of Preliminary Placement Requirements for Sidewalk Vending” document that was submitted by the BSS and presented to the public appears to be cut-and-paste directly from LAMC 42.00(f)(6) governing the placement of news racks. Needless to say, sidewalk vending has regulatory considerations distinct from news racks. We sincerely hope that the CLA intends to give these rules and regulations the attention they deserve and consider provisions that respond to the unique characteristics of the vending trade.¹⁰ These regulations should focus on protecting safety rather than promoting economic protectionism.

For example, vendors should always leave at least 5 feet of sidewalk clear to avoid obstructing pedestrian traffic and adhere to ADA standards. Vendors should be prohibited from obstructing the entrance or exit to nearby buildings, and vending should not occur adjacent to curbs or fire hydrants/emergency facilities. A complete list of suggested placement regulations is attached as an appendix.

Conclusion

We appreciate the CLA’s commitment to meaningful community engagement in this process. The above recommendations are the result of numerous interviews, town hall meetings, and discussions with hundreds of vendors, stakeholders, and community members from across the City - with additional input from the policy, legal, health, economic, and community development experts in the LA Street Vendor Campaign coalition. These recommendations solve some of the key challenges facing the city, and bring forth innovative solutions that pull from the best practices of other major cities, while being sensitive to the unique fabric of Los Angeles. We appreciate your careful review and close consideration of these recommendations in preparing the CLA’s final report to the Economic Development Committee.

¹⁰ For a detailed analysis of best practices in regulating street vending, see Gregg Kettles, *Crystals, Mud, and Space: Street Vending Informality*, in *The Informal America City*, 227-242 (V. Mukhija & A Loukaitou-Sideris, eds. 2014)

Now is the time for Los Angeles to join the ranks of every other major city in the country by creating a pathway to legalized sidewalk vending. But it is also the time for Los Angeles to *lead*. Our city can set the standard for community-driven economic development. We can tear down barriers to opportunity and eliminate unjust criminalization practices. We can create a vending program that promotes economic mobility, increases healthy food access, activates our commercial corridors and public spaces, and protects the health and safety of all Angelenos. This means a citywide vending permit program for parks and sidewalks with commonsense sidewalk placement restrictions, accessible and inclusive permitting procedures, robust technical assistance, and humane compliance strategies. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

The Los Angeles Street Vendor Campaign¹¹

¹¹ The Los Angeles Street Vendor Campaign is endorsed by: East LA Community Corporation (ELACC); Leadership for Urban Renewal Now (LURN); Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights of Los Angeles (CHIRLA); Women Organizing Resources Knowledge and Services (WORKS); The LA Food Policy Council; Public Counsel; Loncheros Association ; Urban Education Policy Institute ; SEIU-United Service Workers West (USWW); Youth Speak Collective; Pacoima Beautiful; Kareem Carts; Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy (LAANE); Proyecto Pastoral; Central American Resource Center (CARECEN); The Public Immigrant Policies Institute of Los Angeles (PIPII); Strategic Actions for a Just Economy (SAJE); Corazon del Pueblo; Community Financial Resource Center (CFRC); Koreatown Immigrant Workers Alliance (KIWA); Esperanza Community Housing Corporation; SEE-LA; Art-Gricultural Farmers Market; St. John's Well Child & Family Center; Little Tokyo Service Center (LTSC); InnerCity Struggle (ICS); Labor Community Strategy Center; Bus Riders Union; Right to the City Alliance; Los Angeles Community Action Network (LA CAN); Guerrilla Food Not Bombs; Restaurant Opportunities Center – Los Angeles (ROC-LA); LA2050; Los Angeles Metropolitan Churches; Community Coalition; United Food Commercial Workers (UFCW) Local 770; Alliance of Californian's for Community Empowerment (ACCE); Strategic Concept in Organizing and Policy Education (SCOPE); A New Way of Life Reentry Project; UNITE HERE Local 11; Urban Semillas; Cyclists Inciting Change thru LIVE Exchange (C.I.C.L.E.); Los Angeles Walks; Institute for Justice; PolicyLink; SEACA; LA MAS; Urban Semillas; Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition; T.R.U.S.T. South LA; Homeboy Industries; Black Workers Center; Raise the Wage LA; LA Food Fight; Meet Every Need with Dignity (MEND); National Lawyers Guild; LA County Federation of Labor AFL-CIO

Recommended Placement Requirements for Sidewalk Vending

No person shall maintain a Vending Operation:

- (a) In such a way that would restrict or interfere with the ingress or egress of the abutting owner or tenant or to create or become a nuisance, or constitute a hazard to traffic, life or property, or an obstruction to adequate access to fire, police, or sanitation vehicles.
- (b) Where placement impedes the flow of pedestrian traffic by reducing the clear space to less than 5 feet or, impedes access to or the use of abutting property, including, but not limited to, residences and places of business.
- (c) Immediately in front of buildings, houses, structures, or public stairs such that it causes a violation of ADA guidelines for pedestrian passage.
- (d) On any part of the public right-of-way that is improved with lawn, flowers, shrubs, trees, other plants or decorative landscaping.
- (e) On the roadway portion of any street, except that Vending shall be permitted within a People St Plaza or other areas reserved exclusively for pedestrian use.
- (f) On medians of divided highways, unless such median is intended as a pedestrian walkway.
- (g) Within ten feet of a fire hydrant.
- (h) Within twenty feet of any hospital or emergency room entrance.
- (i) Where exigent circumstances exist and a police officer or other authorized officer or employee of the city gives notice to a Vendor to temporarily move from a location such Vendor shall not Vend from such location. For the purpose of this subsection, exigent circumstances shall include but not be limited to, unusually heavy pedestrian or vehicular traffic, existence of any obstructions in the public space at or near such location, an accident, fire or other emergency situation at or near such location, or a parade, demonstration, or other such event or occurrence at or near such location.