

Communication from Public

Name: Raymond Goldstone

Date Submitted: 06/20/2022 04:00 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: It is my understanding that PLUM will consider approving the drafting of an ordinance to allow for the placement of digital messaging billboards in Los Angeles that are part of the Metro Digital Billboard Program (Transit Communications Network / TCN). I OPPOSE THE DRAFTING OF THE PROPOSED ORDINANCE. Please consider the following issues which have led to my opposition. IT IS PREMATURE TO CONSIDER any City ordinance to allow this program to move forward until the EIR for the program identifies impacts, available mitigations, and alternatives; and that assessment can be publicly reviewed. THE CITY HAS FAILED TO ADDRESS critical issues related to changing digital messaging billboards and driver distraction particularly in light of the City's increasing numbers of accidents, injuries, and deaths of our most vulnerable street users: pedestrians and bicyclists. NOW (AND AT THE TIME OF METRO-CITY MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT APPROVAL IN DECEMBER 2021), THERE HAS BEEN A LACK OF OPPORTUNITY for adequate public discussion and for neighborhood council and community input. THE CITY HAS FAILED TO RECOGNIZE AND TO ADDRESS the larger policy issues related to minimizing the numbers of digital advertising faces on our public right-of-way while maximizing revenues from the LIMITED sign faces allowed. THE CITY APPEARS TO BE RUSHING to occupy our streets and highways with structures containing changing digital advertising messages based upon the dubious "logic" that adding more and more signage will generate more revenue. A strategy to reduce signage thereby increasing the revenues generated from fewer select signs has never been considered. THE CITY APPEARS TO BE UNWILLING TO STUDY OR ADOPT a policy to derive the greatest income from the least numbers of signs. Contracts for signage last for many years, and in the case of the TCN, the agreement goes for 20 years. Once installed, these structures will be polluting our environment for years to come! THE CITY HAS FAILED TO ADDRESS aesthetic issues and impacts on nearby properties; TO ADDRESS quality of life issues for those living with these signs; AND TO ACKNOWLEDGE the cumulative impacts of placing more and more digital changing messaging structures on our public right-of-way (through this program and

others currently under consideration). THE CITY HAS FAILED TO STUDY AND TO PREPARE THE REQUISITE ANALYSIS of impacts on the City's legal/ long-range ability to regulate off-site signage/billboards. THERE IS A LACK of any mechanism to allow for public input, council district input, neighborhood council input into the actual placement of these proposed billboards. THE CITY HAS FAILED TO IDENTIFY potential conflicts with existing City programs and ordinances such as specific plans that regulate signage and/or are contained in the City's General Plan and Mobility Element. THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION.

Communication from Public

Name: J. Ross

Date Submitted: 06/20/2022 04:28 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I oppose this because: The Council approved a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the City and Metro on Dec. 8 for the TCN program - - this, without any public outreach or discourse. The MOA motion indicates that Metro is the lead agency responsible for CEQA compliance. Metro has just started the EIR process with recent scoping meetings in May (not well publicized and whose comment period ended June 1st already). Is it appropriate for the City to be moving forward with the ordinance and the program prior to an EIR being completed that will reveal impacts and possible alternatives to the program? The City continues to ignore the serious driver distraction dangers of changing digital messaging and ignores public comment about studies done around the world that document these dangers. Are Vision Zero goals no longer important in our city that sees escalating carnage on our streets? The Dept. of Transportation has never been tasked with a review of the recent studies and literature available. Why not? In a city that should be working to increase our urban tree canopy, instead we see a rush to occupy our streets and highways with structures containing changing digital advertising messages. The logic behind adding more and more signage to generate ad revenues is folly. A strategy to reduce signage thereby increasing the revenues generated from fewer select signs has never been considered. The City appears to be pursuing a strategy to allow growing numbers of signs which carry the assumption that more signage equals more revenues. Not demonstrated as true! Rather, the city should adopt a policy to derive the greatest income from the LEAST numbers of signs. Aesthetics matter. Contracts for signage last for many years, and in the case of the TCN, the agreement goes for 20 years. Once installed, these structures will be polluting our environment for years to come. There are also important legal considerations and concerns that this program (and others currently under consideration in the City) may serve to undermine the City's long-term authority to regulate off-site signage/billboards -- the result of hard-won court victories over many years that defined the City's authority. We've won court cases against digital/video billboards. Now you want to abdicate regulation of them and give the sign industry even more power. The program proposes: "34 Freeway-Facing structures and 22 Non-Freeway-Facing structures

in the City of Los Angeles on Metro-owned property. This is a horrible idea. Also.... ?Premature to consider any City ordinance to allow this program to move forward until the EIR for the program identifies impacts, available mitigations and alternatives and can be publicly reviewed. Failure of the City to address the critical issues related to digital billboards and driver distraction coupled with the city's increasing numbers of accidents, injuries and deaths of pedestrians and bicyclists - our most vulnerable street users. Lack of adequate public discussion and opportunity for neighborhood council and community input (now and at the time of Metro-City Memorandum of Agreement approval in December 2021). Failure to address aesthetic issues and impacts on nearby properties. Failure to address quality of life issues for those in these sign's visual reach. Failure to acknowledge cumulative impacts of placing more and more digital changing messaging structures on our public right-of-way (through this program and others currently under consideration). Absence of analysis of impacts on the City's legal/ long-range ability to regulate off-site signage/billboards Failure to recognize and address the larger policy issues related to minimizing the numbers of advertising faces on our public right-of-way while maximizing revenues from those LIMITED sign faces allowed. Lack of any mechanism to allow for public input, council district input, neighborhood council input into the actual placement of these proposed billboards. Potential conflicts with existing City programs and ordinances such as specific plans that regulate signage and /or are contained in the City's General Plan and Mobility Element.

Communication from Public

Name: Ron Bitzer

Date Submitted: 06/20/2022 04:47 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: Sir or Madam, A May 31, 2022 fatal freeway car crash at about 10:30 PM just after the vehicle reportedly passed a large OFF-SITE digital billboard facing the northbound driver before Victory Blvd (170 Freeway) may be an example of driver distraction on this freeway. A final report has not been issued (LA Times, June 2, 2022). Fortunately the City of LA is not overwhelmed with OFF-SITE signs blinking every 8 seconds. Your proposal to erect digital signs on major streets as well as near freeways should be prepared in cooperation with other public agencies proposing the same. Public Works seeks to install 300 digital signs at bus stop locations as part of its revised "street furniture" fiasco. Tourism Destination Streets may soon feature digital signs advocated by the Convention Bureau. An overall strategy for residents who now access travel and other City data by smartphone should be presented to residents ---- knowing the "silo" effect of government.

Communication from Public

Name: Phil Davis

Date Submitted: 06/20/2022 02:54 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I am opposed to increasing the digital billboard footprint in Los Angeles and, specifically, any proposed ordinance that would allow for placement of digital billboards as part of the Metro digital billboard program, for the following reasons: 1. It is premature to consider any City ordinance to allow this program to move forward until the EIR for the program identifies impacts, available mitigations and alternatives and can be publicly reviewed. 2. The City has failed to address the critical issues related to digital billboards and driver distraction coupled with the city's increasing numbers of accidents, injuries and deaths of pedestrians and bicyclists - our most vulnerable street users. 3. There has been a lack of adequate public discussion and opportunity for neighborhood council and community input (now and at the time of Metro-City Memorandum of Agreement approval in December 2021). 4. There has been a complete failure to address aesthetic issues and impacts on nearby properties. 5. There has been a failure to address quality of life issues for those in these sign's visual reach. 6. Failure to acknowledge cumulative impacts of placing more and more digital changing messaging structures on our public right-of-way (through this program and others currently under consideration). 7. There has been an absence of analysis of impacts on the City's legal/ long-range ability to regulate off-site signage/billboards 8. There has been a failure to recognize and address the larger policy issues related to minimizing the numbers of advertising faces on our public right-of-way while maximizing revenues from those LIMITED sign faces allowed. 9. There is a lack of any mechanism to allow for public input, council district input, neighborhood council input into the actual placement of these proposed billboards. 10. There are potential conflicts with existing City programs and ordinances such as specific plans that regulate signage and /or are contained in the City's General Plan and Mobility Element.

Communication from Public

Name: Dan Silver, MD

Date Submitted: 06/20/2022 01:52 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I OPPOSE this item. The City utterly fails to keep the our streets safe for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other drivers. Digital signs command attention and cause distracted driving. How do you reconcile this with a goal to reduce fatalities to zero? It is premature to advance this program until an EIR is completed. In addition, the visual blight and degradation of the public space due to ads is appalling. You should now allow for much greater public input. Please vote 'no'. The Council needs to stand up for SAFETY.

Communication from Public

Name: nancy freedman

Date Submitted: 06/20/2022 01:36 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I have been against digital billboards in LA for over a decade. Where they used to be before a law suit had them taken down, there are calm intersections and static billboards. Other than the time the next bus arrives, there should be no moving eye candy. in bus shelters or anywhere that the quality of life is disrupted for financial gain. Thank you Nancy Freedman

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 06/20/2022 08:16 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: Re Council File Number 22-0392 We oppose drafting of an ordinance for the placement of digital billboards in Los Angeles for the following reasons: 1) EIR has yet to identify impacts and submit them for public review. 2) Issue of driver distraction which leads to injury and death of other drivers, cyclists and pedestrians is not being given sufficient attention. 3) Neighborhood Councils and community at large have not had sufficient opportunity to weigh in on this very serious matter. 4) There is a failure here to acknowledge the cumulative impact and the visual blight from so many digital signs. 5) City has failed to put in place a mechanism to determine where digital billboards would be placed. Please keep our streets safe and free of distracting digital signs. Driving in Los Angeles is already challenging enough without added clutter taking attention from safe operation of motor vehicles. Thank you for considering my input. Sincerely, Margaret and Charles Healy .

Communication from Public

Name: Dr No

Date Submitted: 06/20/2022 10:59 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: DIGITAL BILLBOARD PROPOSALS SAY NO to this catastrophic barbarian blight of digital disfigurements which hasten decline of our 'civilization' as it used to be called.. Replacing planet-saving trees with barren digital video pixels is madness, and should be made illegal City of Los Angeles will become an international laughing-stock if these proposals are approved There must be full and fair EIR carried out to identify impacts, mitigations and alternatives for public review Additionally these concerns must also be properly addressed: Failure of the City to address the critical issues related to digital billboards and driver distraction coupled with the city's increasing numbers of accidents, injuries and deaths of pedestrians and bicyclists - our most vulnerable street users. Lack of adequate public discussion and opportunity for neighborhood council and community input (now and at the time of Metro-City Memorandum of Agreement approval in December 2021). Failure to address aesthetic issues and impacts on nearby properties. Failure to address quality of life issues for those in these sign's visual reach. Failure to acknowledge cumulative impacts of placing more and more digital changing messaging structures on our public right-of-way (through this program and others currently under consideration). Absence of analysis of impacts on the City's legal/ long-range ability to regulate off-site signage/billboards Failure to recognize and address the larger policy issues related to minimizing the numbers of advertising faces on our public right-of-way while maximizing revenues from those LIMITED sign faces allowed. Lack of any mechanism to allow for public input, council district input, neighborhood council input into the actual placement of these proposed billboards. Potential conflicts with existing City programs and ordinances such as specific plans that regulate signage and /or are contained in the City's General Plan and Mobility Element. It is not good enough that these proposals have gotten this far without all these concerns being addressed If this committed fails to support the people of our City, it will forever be a dark stain on their public service careers Sincerely sonamd@msn.com

Communication from Public

Name: Robin Rudisill

Date Submitted: 06/20/2022 09:36 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: PLUM Councilmembers: ?It is premature to consider any City ordinance to allow this program to move forward until the EIR for the program identifies impacts, available mitigations and alternatives and can be publicly reviewed. There has been a failure by the City to address the critical issues related to digital billboards and driver distraction coupled with the city's increasing numbers of accidents, injuries and deaths of pedestrians and bicyclists - our most vulnerable street users. There has been a lack of adequate public discussion and opportunity for neighborhood council and community input (both now and at the time of Metro-City Memorandum of Agreement approval in December 2021). There has been a lack of any mechanism to allow for public input, council district input, neighborhood council input into the actual placement of these proposed billboards. There has been a complete failure to address aesthetic issues and impacts on nearby properties. There has been a failure to address quality of life issues for those in these signs' visual reach. There has been a failure to acknowledge the cumulative impact of placing more and more digital changing messaging structures on our public right-of-way (through this program and others currently under consideration). There has been an absence of analysis of impacts on the City's legal/ long-range ability to regulate off-site signage/billboards. There has been a failure to recognize and address the larger policy issues related to minimizing the numbers of advertising faces on our public right-of-way while maximizing revenues from those LIMITED sign faces allowed. There are potential conflicts with existing City programs and ordinances such as specific plans that regulate signage and /or are contained in the City's General Plan and Mobility Element. Please vote NO or continue agenda Item 3 to prepare and present an ordinance to allow digital off-site signs to be displayed on structures that are part of the Transportation Communication Network Program between the City and Metro.