I sat down with a team from the LA County Department of Public Works to discuss the various details and goals of the program. With the pilot parklets, their goal was to implement them quickly to test out their viability. This meant that there wasn’t as much public outreach to gather surrounding business and/or community support. In terms of the designs, they are all similar, ‘modular’ designs that can easily be replicated. They said that the community is allowed to come up with their own designs, but that they discourage it because it is more costly and complicates the permitting process. This proves to be the same issue that People St. and other programs around the country are dealing with—compromising community input with quick project delivery. They are looking into ways to slightly expand the options and existing designs, but for now all three are extremely similar, using the same materials.

In terms of locations, they looked for sponsoring restaurants or cafes to support the parklet because they believed that pedestrian activity would be greater in these areas. The space remains public and there is no table or dining service allowed on the parklets, but the businesses believe that they will get an increase in sales due to the extra public space. This contrasts to a lot of the People St. projects that have been purposely placed in areas that are not associated directly with one particular business to further emphasize that it is public space. Even though the parklets in LA County have signs that show that they are public space, typical residents may assume that it is only for the adjacent business. This was also a concern for the Vancouver parklet program, as the UCLA parklet study notes: “An ongoing challenge has been that, even with a large sign that says “public seating” attached to the structure, many assume that the seating belongs to the adjacent café.” (UCLA, 2012; 58) It is also worth noting that the city of Long Beach, adjacent to Los Angeles, has a couple of parklets, in which they allow restaurants and cafes to provide dining service; they aren’t considered public space.
A precautionary criticism for LA County is the parklets’ association with private businesses and the designs that, thus far, have much less variation than the People St. projects. In Robin Abad’s study examining parklets and plazas in California, he advocates for parklets that are distinctly and clearly seen as public. He fears “the parklet may come to signify less for enhancement of the accessible pedestrian realm and more for economic boosterism and privatization. This thrust would concur readily with opinions that Parklets and Pedestrian Plazas are a function and/or facilitators of gentrification.” (Abad, 169) In an article by the artist and designer who heavily influenced the initiation of the parklet program in San Francisco, John Bela expresses similar concerns. He says that the Mission District neighborhood association in San Francisco has even blocked parklets because they feared they would bring unwanted investment and gentrification.

In my tour of East LA with James Rojas, who was showing me examples of what he described as Latino Urbanism, we noticed the East LA parklets, which appeared to be underused. I later asked Rojas in an interview what he thought about the East LA parklets and he said “the materials aren’t consistent with what Latinos like (the wood and color). They are an example of cut & paste urbanism. They don’t realize how different cultures use space. Latinos socialize and congregate in a different way—in bigger groups with the whole family. They have more family-based socializing.” This description of the parklets as having ‘cut & paste’ designs was the same criticism that the LA Times architecture critic Christopher Hawthorne had about the People. St. program. The East LA parklets need to have more community engagement and outreach to make sure that the location and designs reflect their needs and values. The program also needs to proceed with caution if the parklets are going to be mostly sponsored by adjacent restaurants or cafes to ensure their image as entirely public space.
POP-UP PLANNING WORKSHOPS

Tactical Urbanism “is being used to bring planning concepts to people physically rather than asking them to come to planning meetings to discuss proposals theoretically. The goal is to show people different opportunities in the real world so that more informed decisions may be made by a more diverse audience of people.” (Lydon, 15) Pop-up planning workshops replace the typical planning meeting where only a small group of people usually attend and are asked to react to words, diagrams, and charts that are difficult for everyone to understand. Proposed design improvements are temporarily built on the street so that people can actually experience and see what certain proposed projects feel like; often there are also community bulletin boards, asking people to give their reactions and propose different projects. Lydon describes how a major utilization of Tactical Urbanism is for increased public involvement—“truly participatory planning must go beyond drawing on flip charts and maps.” (Lydon, 15)

Melendrez, an urban planning, design, and landscape architecture firm based in Los Angeles, has cooperated with the city of LA on a number of ‘pop-up’ workshops and events. One in particular was the ‘Pop-up Mango’ (Michigan Avenue Neighborhood Greenway) workshop in Santa Monica. On the Melendrez firm website they describe the workshop as “the first of its kind within the region, temporarily transforming the street to demonstrate proposed changes, such as: traffic calming devices, traffic circles, chicanes, curb extensions, enhanced landscaping, mini-parks and places for neighbors to gather. The event gave citizens an opportunity to see and evaluate public realm improvements during the planning process, hands-on.” The city of Long Beach also initiated a very similar pop-up planning workshop called ‘Walk Forth’ Long Beach that included green alleys, landscaped median, community gardening, pedestrian wayfinding, pop-up plaza, a pop-up parklet, and a mid-block crosswalk. Other similar events in Los Angeles
include ‘Pop-up Reseda Blvd’ in the valley, and an envisioning of the potential improvements to Pacific Blvd in Huntington Park that included a pop-up plaza and festival. With pop-up planning workshops like these, not only do they reach a wider audience, but they can “help allay NIMBY (not in my backyard) fears as the possibilities for change are demonstrated in the short term.” (Lydon, 14) Non-profit organizations have also taken part in pop-up planning workshops. As part of the community outreach for the Bradley Plaza in Pacoima and the Leimert Park Village Plaza, the community groups initiated pop-up planning workshops, closing down the proposed plaza areas to show the community what the People St. plaza could bring to their community.

During this pop-up plaza in Pacoima, James Rojas showed an even more low-cost, inclusive way to demonstrate and engage the community through his ‘Place It’ workshop. At the pop-up plaza, Rojas allowed the community to create the changes that they wanted to see by using little trinkets and various small miscellaneous objects—arranging them in ways that represented their design improvements. These ‘Place It’ workshops can also be categorized as ‘Pop-up Planning Workshops’ because they can happen anywhere and they use temporary materials to represent certain design improvements. The ‘Place It’ workshops are, in essence, Tactical Urbanism on an even more micro scale.
A coalition of organizations called ‘Free Lo(t)s Angeles’ (FLA) is another example of community organizations working to show what’s possible. The description of the initiative on their Facebook page states: “FLA organizes “pop up” events on vacant lots identified through meetings with local residents, community organizations, and city council offices. FLA guides a community planning process to learn what resources residents want to bring to their community.” Most of their pop-up workshops have occurred in South LA, but also include other lower-income communities with unused public vacant lots.

**PHASE 0 IMPLEMENTATION**

As part of already approved plans for streets, cities have been implementing them in small, low-cost phases that allow data to be collected and plans to be implemented faster and
with more feedback. Mike Lydon calls this ‘Phase 0 Implementation.’ A famous example is in downtown Los Angeles on Broadway. Called the Broadway ‘dress rehearsal,’ the planning firm Melendrez worked with the city of LA to implement the temporary first phase of the Broadway Streetscape Masterplan. Melendrez’s website summarizes the concept:

“This project is being implemented in a temporary pilot installation, which includes a reconfiguration of the six lanes of traffic into three lanes, enhancement of crosswalks, the addition of curbside parking to respond to business needs, and a "dress rehearsal" installation of sidewalk extensions delineated in the roadway with striping, special surfacing of the existing concrete roadbed, protection of these new pedestrian areas with bollards and planters, and street furnishings including movable tables, chairs and umbrellas.”

These pilot implementation projects are similar to the pop-up planning workshops, except that they are part of an existing plan and usually lasts an extended amount of time before iteratively becoming more permanent over time.

**POP-UP EVENTS**

Pop-up events, like the other pop-up categories I just discussed, temporarily re-use public space to show what is possible. What makes them different is that they are not used as part of specific plans. A famous example that has been used all over the world is called Open Streets, or in Los Angeles it’s called CicLAvia. This event temporarily shuts off a number of consecutive streets to cars for a day, only allowing non-motorized forms of transportation such as pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition to advocating for safer streets for cyclists and pedestrians, CicLAvia also brings an opportunity for other forms of Tactical Urbanism to be used. At the most recent CicLAvia event in the Valley, the city used the day as an opportunity to test out a protected bike lane on Chandler Avenue, called ‘Pop-up Chandler.’ This is an example of a pop-up planning workshop being used at the same time as CicLAvia. Also during CicLAvia in December of 2014 the Free Lo(t)s Angeles group that I mentioned in the ‘Pop-up Planning Workshop’ section,
activated a vacant lot in South LA. CicLAvia seems to have the potential to be a platform to test out many forms of Tactical Urbanism.

An international pop-up event called Park(ing) Day, is where individuals, organizations, and city officials all over the world, including Los Angeles, transform any metered parking space into a temporary public space. This event happens every year on September 19th and since it’s beginning in 2005 in San Francisco, has scaled up to influence parklet programs across the country. This event shows how a small-scale, low-cost, temporary action has spurred a movement across the world. Park(ing) Day is one of the most popular and successful forms of Tactical Urbanism.

Another pop-up event occurred on three blocks of York Blvd in Highland Park for the opening of the York Park on February 21st of this year. The event was called the ‘York Village El Mercado’ and closed down the blocks, allowing dozens of food trucks and small pop-up businesses to line the boulevard; tables, umbrellas, and chairs were also put in an intersection. Similar events like these in Los Angeles, pop-up events that center around selling food and goods, include the hundreds of Farmer’s Markets in the city, ‘Odd Markets,’ and Art Walks. Farmer’s Markets and ‘Odd Market’s temporarily activate vacant parking lots and sometimes close streets to allow only pedestrians.
‘Pop-up Planning Workshops,’ ‘Phase 0 Implementation,’ and ‘Pop-up Events’ are all examples of Los Angeles city officials demonstrating what is possible and changing the way in which people think about public space. They do not fall in line with the official programs of Tactical Urbanism such as the People St. parklet and plaza program because they are more
temporary, but are necessary to discuss in the context of Tactical Urbanism in Los Angeles. They are small-scale, low-cost urban interventions that try to catalyze longer-term change.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

“Empowering citizens to contribute to the design of their surroundings, within some parameters, can result in numerous benefits, from innovative solutions to a more engaged citizenry, and DIY projects can illustrate to planners and other citizens what is possible. The role of planners will be to harness that enthusiasm and creativity in ways that are safe, equitable, effective and locally appropriate.” (Finn, 395)

“Enable public servants to understand the shifts from leading to enabling, from controlling to influencing, and from operating in isolation to working in partnership with others in order to better serve the public.” (Camponeschi, 72)

“Give communities tools instead of ideas—this will give them the confidence to frame their own needs and explore their own solutions.” (Camponeschi, 69)

“Use co-design to understand the daily experiences, needs, and contributions of diverse actors in diverse communities—we need to broaden our conception of which knowledge matters and foster a politics based on the values and aspirations of citizens.” (Camponeschi, 70)

**EVERYDAY/LATINO URBANISM**

“Through their cultural, social, and economic behavior patterns and needs, Latinos imagine, investigate, and transform their physical landscape. For example: a fence becomes a place of social interaction; a store sign becomes a work of art; and a front yard becomes a plaza. Planners often lack the tools to investigate and understand this built-environment, or take seriously these interventions, even though they are creating such a palpable sense of place and neighborhood identity.” (Rojas, 2015)

It is evident that there are many small, daily actions and interventions occurring in East Los Angeles—street vending, murals, front-yard plazas, religious shrines—that together contest the auto-oriented environment, create a vibrant street life, provide necessary income, and most importantly reveal a Latino community with strong cultural and social values and needs. “The real challenges facing contemporary city dwellers today is that the process does not serve their interests and or cultural expectations.” (Lydon, 81) These residents in East LA walk, bike, and take transit in a city that favors cars. Los Angeles needs to understand that its many different
communities consisting of many different ethnicities live in many different ways and one overarching prescriptive plan or code won’t address their many different needs. Los Angeles needs to “set up spaces to encourage diversity of use and users—leaving room for self-organization and DIY development in public spaces is a powerful way to build community, encourage interaction, and focus on more than just monetary exchanges.” (Camponeschi, 70)

In a recent article by James Rojas he talks about how urban planners in Los Angeles don’t pay attention to local values and context enough. “Despite these cultural, social, and visual interventions, urban planners often ignore these cultural assets, which are rarely found in the local planning and zoning codes. Unlike most U.S. communities, which are created and regulated by zoning codes, there is no Latino urbanism zoning code. The Boyle Heights' zoning code is similar to the West Los Angeles community of Mar Vista, but these communities feel, look, function very differently.” (Rojas, 2015) The city needs to look at the existing activity, the examples of Latino Urbanism, and give them the tools to express and expand upon those actions.

One specific action that the city could take is to legalize street vending, as this is a vital component to the East LA street life. One way in which James Rojas enables the community to express their values and culture is through his ‘Place It’ workshops. He works with people through art to allow residents to create their own landscapes and express their own values; through his artistic approach he levels the playing field and empowers all different types of people to have a say in the planning process. Women, children, and immigrants who are often underrepresented voices, are given a chance to be heard and express their ideas. People use random small objects and toys to represent and create spaces that they value. James Rojas’ ‘Place It’ workshops take the principles of Tactical Urbanism—small scale, temporary, hands-on actions—and applies them to each individual.
An LA Times article by its architecture critic Christopher Hawthorne argues that the city of LA is actually starting to incorporate Latino values into their policies. He cites the People St. program and the mayor’s Great Streets Initiative as examples of the city sharing the Latino values of walking, biking, and transit. He fears, however, that these official programs that are trying to improve Los Angeles and the predominantly Latino neighborhoods, could displace its residents. “In Highland Park, East L.A. and elsewhere, immigrants are already feeling financial pressure to leave neighborhoods that are being actively remade in their image — or marketed precisely for the appeal that Latino Urbanism has lent their sidewalks and streets.” (Hawthorne, 2014) This argument coincides with the question in my research about how the city can formalize unsanctioned, DIY activity that adequately maintains the values, creativity, and input that the original intervention contained. When the city becomes more flexible and enabling of Latino culture it needs to do it in a way that robustly engages the community and empowers them to still design and create the spaces that they want; this will help prevent displacement and gentrification.

FUNCTIONAL & COMMUNAL

One of the consistent challenges with unsanctioned examples of Tactical and DIY Urbanism expressed in the literature was their potential to not represent the community’s needs and catalyze gentrification—acts of individual interests imposed on the community. The most valuable acts of unauthorized urban interventions are those that are done in collaboration with other community members. The community acts together to make immediate changes to the built environment instead of just individuals. Most of the examples that I gave—‘DIY Social Spaces’ in Boyle Heights, ‘Community Living Rooms’ throughout LA, ‘Intersection Repair’ in Koreatown, and ‘Guerilla Gardening’ in South LA—all were initiated and performed by
community organizations. I see potential in Los Angeles for more non-profit and community organizations to take on the Tactical Urbanism approach and make immediate, civic-minded changes to their neighborhood. For example, the city needs to look at the interventions that Union de Vecinos is doing and provide them with the tools, maybe in the form of expedited permits or funding, to enact these changes and even build upon them to have a more lasting impact on their neighborhood. One of the focuses of Union de Vecinos’s actions are centered around the hundreds of alleyways around Boyle Heights—this could be a starting point for the city to look at in terms of an enabling partnership with the community. Steve Cancian’s ‘Community Living Rooms’ are a great example of how officials in Los Angeles were responsive and enabling to the community-led changes being made in the city; now there are dozens of these projects in the city, mostly in lower-income neighborhoods and around neglected bus stops. The Los Angeles Eco-Village did an intersection repair in their neighborhood. Union de Vecinos has also transformed many intersections in a very similar way in Boyle Heights. Los Angeles may want to look at the possibility of implementing a version of Portland’s official ‘Intersection Repair’ program and fit it to the context of Los Angeles. Whatever the response of the city, people are changing the landscape to fit their needs and make the streets safer and the city needs to respond. Donovan Finn sums this concept up perfectly when he states:

“Empowering citizens to contribute to the design of their surroundings, within some parameters, can result in numerous benefits, from innovative solutions to a more engaged citizenry, and DIY projects can illustrate to planners and other citizens what is possible. The role of planners will be to harness that enthusiasm and creativity in ways that are safe, equitable, effective and locally appropriate.” (Finn, 395)
PEOPLE ST.

The People St. program in Los Angeles is in its beginning stages. Like the principles of Tactical Urbanism, it is iteratively responding to its challenges as they appear. There is not enough evidence to suggest that the program, due to its reliance on private partners, only serves the more affluent neighborhoods. With many lower-income neighborhoods in Los Angeles having a strong history of grass-roots organization, this inequity of location may not be as big of an issue with Los Angeles as it has been in other cities. Regardless, Los Angeles needs to be precautionary and ensure that the neighborhoods most in need of public space are receiving parklets and plazas. San Francisco and New York City have both mapped out areas of the city that need parklets or plazas the most; Los Angeles needs to create this type of map that identifies neglected areas that lack public space. New York City’s DOT “attempted to address the inequity through an $800,000 public-private partnership with JP Morgan Chase to help economically distressed neighborhoods implement and manage plaza programs locally.” (Lydon, 163) NYC has a non-profit organization called the Neighborhood Plaza Partnership that helps communities apply that otherwise may not have the resources or organizational capacity. In addition, NYC also provides extra ‘points’ and prioritizes the plaza applications in most needed areas. Los Angeles needs to look to NYC to possibly replicate these types of measures to ensure that all communities are being served.

Another area that the People St. program needs to address is its flexibility in design. The ‘Kit of Parts’ may work for some locations, but if even the slightest changes to logo and color for the Leimert Park Village Plaza were difficult then something needs to be changed. Community-input in terms of design should not be heavily jeopardized even if the implementation process is slightly slower. With the San Francisco’s Pavement to Parks program “the guidelines are not
very prescriptive. These guidelines will allow parklets to have a unique character and display a sense of belonging to their particular neighborhood, as the city cherishes the diversity of parklet designs.” (UCLA, 38-39) The NYC plaza program, for example has some pre-approved design options, but they encourage local, public art. The UCLA’s Luskin School of Public Affairs study titled *Reclaiming the Right of Way: A Toolkit for Creating and Implementing Parklets* also suggests creative designs. “Parklets can be functional and aesthetic assets for cities, especially if they demonstrate unique and innovative architectural and landscape designs. Cities should encourage innovation and experimentation in parklet design. At times, design competitions or charrettes may produce a rich inventory of ideas about parklet design.” (UCLA, 72)

While I have referred to the parklet and plaza programs in NYC and San Francisco in reference to equity and flexibility of design, I think that Los Angeles needs to adapt the People St. program to further reflect the landscape of Los Angeles. NYC and San Francisco are extremely dense cities with very high levels of pedestrian activity on most of their streets. Los Angeles is overwhelmingly more auto-oriented, without a continuous network of streets that are walkable. While the city is starting to invest more attention into pedestrian and transit improvements, they are still trying to urge more people to walk. NYC and San Francisco already have that existing vibrant pedestrian life that is a critical component to parklets and plazas being heavily used. Although the People St. program prioritizes locations that already have a decent amount of pedestrian life, these areas’ streets are still not as crowded as NYC or SF. I go by the York Blvd parklet often, for example, at various times of the day and I rarely see more than one person using it, if at all. York Blvd does have a dense array of shops and higher pedestrian activity than most Los Angeles neighborhoods, but this walkable commercial area only lasts for three blocks. In this sense, the parklets and plazas in Los Angeles are more aspirational in trying
to attract more pedestrian life. The parklets and plazas are a great first step and an amazingly innovative leap forward in promoting a pedestrian-friendly Los Angeles, but it will still take a while; in the spirit of Tactical Urbanism, hopefully these short-term, low-cost projects catalyze longer-term change in the pedestrian realm both physically and behaviorally.

Also worth noting is that the parklets and plazas are prioritized in commercial areas, with high pedestrian activity, and speed limits of 25mph. They can also be located on streets up to 35mph, but there has to be a five-foot buffer between the travel lane and the project, at least for parklets—this buffer usually is in the form of an existing bike lane. Streets and areas that meet these criteria seem to be limited in Los Angeles. I propose either making a map of the streets in Los Angeles that tentatively meet these criteria or expanding the guidelines and design to adapt to residential areas and streets with faster traffic. Included, for example, in the UCLA parklet toolkit, they identified potential plazas in a residential area and near a school. Expanded criteria in terms of location should be examined.

I also think that the People St. program should expand the application-based concept to include fast-tracked crosswalks, bulb-outs, and other street safety improvements. An example of this type of project is in the city of Hamilton, Ontario in Canada. The city of Hamilton, as a response to unsanctioned, DIY street improvements, created an official program that quickly implements traffic bollards, high-visibility crosswalks, and curb-extensions with low-cost materials. Mike Lydon describes Hamilton’s approach in his book Tactical Urbanism and says that “today, the city continues to develop pilot projects and is looking into developing an online platform for citizens to more easily suggest locations in need of improvement by the tools of Tactical Urbanism.” (Lydon, 107)

In Long Beach, there was a project that transformed part of a parking lot into a plaza
using cheap, low-cost materials; they called the project ‘Park(d) Plaza,’ which was initiated in 2012. Given the ridiculously excessive amounts of parking and parking lots in Los Angeles, I believe that this concept should be taken into consideration with the People St. program.

**LA COUNTY PARKLETS**

I think that the LA County parklets, despite just opening their three pilot parklets a few weeks ago, should seriously seek to engage the residents as much as possible in terms of design, location, and general acceptance. The designs thus far are too manufactured and as James Rojas said, an example of “cut & paste urbanism.” The predominantly Hispanic culture in East LA, as shown through the way they transform their environment through Latino Urbanism, holds strong values and those should be heavily examined when considering parklets. Los Angeles County also needs to be precautionary about all of their parklets being located in front of sponsoring businesses to make sure that people know that it is a separate public space to be used by everyone.

**OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS**

As I have briefly mentioned, the Free Lo(t)s Angeles group, a coalition of organizations, holds pop-up events in vacant lots, predominantly in South LA, to show possible transformations and get the community’s input. I believe that the city of Los Angeles could build upon Free Lo(t)s Angeles to become an official program that allows communities and neighborhoods to temporarily activate vacant lots with their own designs and programs. Washington D.C. has a Tactical Urbanism program that deals with vacant lots called the Temporary Urbanism Initiative (TUI). “The Temporary Urbanism Initiative (TUI) was created to focus on transforming vacant spaces throughout the city, highlighting their potential to provide services and activities to local residents and to boost economic development.” (Pfeifer, 22) Los Angeles is a city with
approximately 26 square miles of publicly owned vacant lots and would definitely benefit from a similar program.

CONCLUSION

“Municipal government is uniquely positioned to create a permitting and regulatory environment that is favorable to the tactical urbanist, and eliminate barriers to would-be leaders in priority neighborhoods.” (ioby, 2015)

“Communities everywhere have ideas for how to improve their neighborhoods. The challenge now is to equip policy makers, local governments, service providers, and professionals with tools and processes that enable local citizens to be partners in creating great sustainable places to live.” (Camponeschi, 113)

Los Angeles is a city with countless examples of small-scale, low-cost urban interventions. From individual illegal street vendors all the way to the official People St. program, Tactical Urbanism is vibrant in LA. A criticism of Tactical Urbanism is that unsanctioned, individual projects are catalysts for gentrification. Another issue with Tactical Urbanism is that the successful examples have predominantly come from young, white, middle-class men. Within the context of Los Angeles, I found that through Latino Urbanism and ‘DIY Social Spaces’ in East LA, ‘Guerrilla Gardening’ in South LA, ‘Intersection Repair’ in Koreatown, and ‘Community Living Rooms’ in various neighborhoods in the city, examples of Tactical Urbanism do exist that provide counterpoints to its common criticisms of equity and gentrification. The locations of these various interventions were all in lower-income communities. Community-initiated examples of unsanctioned, urban interventions are ideal because their improvements represent the character and needs of the neighborhood. I also learned that many initiatives are similar to Tactical Urbanism, but because of their intentions and sometimes-ephemeral nature, they aren’t labeled as Tactical Urbanism and therefore may be left out of the discussion. This leaves out most lower-income communities whose intent may not be to document, measure results, or blog about the experience. Cities needs to recognize all of the
communities acting in incremental, unauthorized ways to improve their surroundings.

Examples of unauthorized projects of Tactical Urbanism becoming official programs, and/or city-initiated Tactical Urbanism programs in general, often have to jeopardize some level of community engagement in order to implement the projects quickly. Also due to their reliance on private partners, they often leave out less affluent neighborhoods and communities. With the People St. program specifically, they are in their beginning stages, but need to expand their flexibility in terms of designs. The LA County pilot parklets also need to expand their design options and more robustly engage the community as they begin to create a formal application-based program.

Los Angeles has a ton of potential to seize upon the creativity and innovation of its residents. Los Angeles needs to create a flexible, enabling, and empowering environment that allows communities to express their cultural, social, and economic needs and values. With the proper tools, Los Angeles can help to provide a city of co-creators in which residents have to power to make an immediate impact in their community.
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