

Communication from Public

Name: Suzanne Gero

Date Submitted: 12/06/2023 09:16 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I would like to state that I am opposed to the electronic billboards for the following reasons: 1. Definite distraction to drivers 2. Light pollution which has a negative effect on wildlife, particularly migrating birds, and also on people's ability to sleep. I am requesting that you also oppose the electronic billboards. I do not see any positive reason to vote for them. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Marion Schulman
Date Submitted: 12/08/2023 12:04 AM
Council File No: 22-0392
Comments for Public Posting: don't let LA really look like Blade Runner. It's already bad enough.

Communication from Public

Name: Dave Chapple
Date Submitted: 12/07/2023 09:35 AM
Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: Greetings Council, I received this information from a fellow neighbor. Please read and consider voting against these Las Vegas style billboards. Understand that the City will have no moral standing to fight private billboards after they approve and benefit from billboards on public land. The neighborhood would appreciate a push-back - - - - - MESSAGE: I have grave concerns about the TCN – Telecommunication Network being considered by the City Council on Friday which will allow for huge digital/electronic billboards. I encourage you to submit a comment about this to the City Council and to your City Council member. Some of the concerns about these billboards are:. These huge electronic billboards will refresh every 8 seconds with commercial messages and only one 8 second message for the public safety. The claim is that they are replacing outdated signs and come with the ability to provide updated information to the public. Metro and the City will split the revenue. Many are concerned about safety. These billboards will be distracting. The Environmental Impact report included limited studies with small sample sizes most of which were industry sponsored. More recent studies have shown these billboards can be distracting to all drivers at higher speed or when driving is challenging, but are especially distracting to the young more inexperienced drivers and older drivers. None of the studies cited by METRO included cities such as ours that have so much traffic as our city. Additionally, none of the studies had large immigrant communities whose primary language is not English. We are concerned that these billboards can impact safety of pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists. See the LA Times editorial today: <https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2023-12-06/los-angeles-ugly-unsafe-digital-billboards> There is also concern for residents and wildlife. Light pollution impacts peoples ability to sleep. Wildlife cannot shut the blinds. Additionally, Los Angeles is a byway for migrating birds. Migrating birds can be distracted by the lights from these electronic billboards. Another concern is corruption. Billboard companies in the past have been implicated in corruption scandals including with Jose Huizar. Finally, there is a concern that the city will end up being sued when accidents occur near these signs which will end up eating up any revenue gained. <https://www.latimes.com/science/story/2022-09-20/how-an-effort-to-reduce-fossil-fuel-use-led-to-another-environmental-problem-light-pollution>

Communication from Public

Name: Andrew Marton

Date Submitted: 12/07/2023 09:44 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: It's these type of fast tracked items that avoid public comment and going through proper channels/committees that create a public perception of unfair lobbying, behind closed door deals and questionable conduct not in the community's interests that blemish the record of the LA City Council. There is absolutely no reason to fast track this item. It's a 20 year contractual commitment with major impact on the city that deserves more discussion and community input. One has to question whether the Olympics and the World Cup events are a driving force for the desired quick vote on this item. Do the right thing and send it back to the proper committees for public comments.

Communication from Public

Name: Jane Ellen Galbraith

Date Submitted: 12/07/2023 02:55 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: Councilmember: I strongly urge you to REJECT the proposed Billboard plan for land owned by the Metropolitan Transportation Authority. The electronic billboards will forever blight Los Angeles and will create safety hazards for everyone-drivers, pedestrians, and bicyclists-forever. Please do not cover Los Angeles with MORE dangerous electronic billboards. Please do not sacrifice street safety and the visual appeal of Los Angeles, which are its great economic and community assets, for a modest funding stream. Our City of Angels has way more visual blight than any "world-class" city should have already! Regards, Jane Galbraith CD 10

Communication from Public

Name: Elaine Waldman

Date Submitted: 12/07/2023 04:50 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: Stop digital billboards. Let us work together, prioritize traffic safety instead of seeking profits by increasing distracting advertising in Los Angeles.

Communication from Public

Name: Richard Stanley
Date Submitted: 12/07/2023 05:32 PM
Council File No: 22-0392
Comments for Public Posting: Put these "trash on poles" up in Los Angeles and YOU on the Council and the Mayor can take the blame for even more outrageous traffic fatalities. Shame on you all who support distracting, ugly billboards in return for billions for the outdoor advertising moguls and chump change for the people of Los Angeles. Richard Stanley Los Feliz

Communication from Public

Name: Paula Carole Yerman

Date Submitted: 12/07/2023 05:59 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I strongly oppose the Metro TCN digital billboard advertising Program because of the impacts to housing, safety, historic-cultural, scenic, coastal, environmental and sensitive use resources. City Council must send the Metro TCN Program Ordinances back to the City Planning Commission for reconsideration per City Charter Sections 555 and 558, following substantive changes adopted by several motions introduced by Council Districts 1, 2, 5, 12, and 13. These changes include: --PLUM restored freeway facing billboard FF-3 that was removed by CPC out of concern for saturation and public safety; --PLUM reduced the CPC recommended distance of 2,640 feet to 1,500 feet between billboards on the same side of the freeway. This will set a negative precedent for all future signs, especially in the downtown area; --PLUM expanded the hours of operation for freeway facing signs; --PLUM reduced the number of existing static billboards to be removed prior to installation of new digital billboards from 125 to 50 initial removals + 4 signs after that (these numbers don't add up to the required 200 sign removals); --PLUM lowered the minimum takedown square footage per sign from 300 square feet (minimum billboard size) to 200 square feet (poster board size); --PLUM opened the door to extend the digital billboard program to a 30-year contract instead of the CPC recommended 20-year contract. I agree with Scenic America and the Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles that the placement of offsite commercial advertising on Metro-owned and controlled property in partnership with the City turns our public rights of way into advertising vehicles for private interests and is antithetical to the idea that citizens should have public spaces and a public sight lines free of all commercialization. Los Angeles continues to march in the wrong direction, toward more visual blight and clutter and privatization of public space, instead of the removal of all billboards from our cityscape. Why? So that a few giant billboard companies can profit? So that advertisers can bombard us with their commercial messages? Why are we selling off what little public visual space we have? Our city should instead be banning billboards, not opening the floodgates for more -- and, in the case of these electronic billboards, the most dangerous form of billboards imaginable. Shame on Los Angeles. Shame on every member of our city council and our mayor for

fast-tracking this wrongheaded, dreadful, pernicious ordinance.
Reverse course! Stop billboard blight! Stop METRO TCN. Thank
you,

Communication from Public

Name: Richard Devletian

Date Submitted: 12/08/2023 08:25 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I strongly oppose the Metro TCN digital billboard advertising Program because of the impacts to housing, safety, historic-cultural, scenic, coastal, environmental and sensitive use resources. I ask the City Council to send the Metro TCN Program Ordinances back to the City Planning Commission for reconsideration per City Charter Sections 555 and 558, following substantive changes adopted by several motions introduced by Council Districts 1, 2, 5, 12, and 13. These changes include: PLUM restored freeway facing billboard FF-3 that was removed by CPC out of concern for saturation and public safety; PLUM reduced the CPC recommended distance of 2,640 feet to 1,500 feet between billboards on the same side of the freeway. This will set a negative precedent for all future signs, especially in the downtown area; PLUM expanded the hours of operation for freeway facing signs; PLUM reduced the number of existing static billboards to be removed prior to installation of new digital billboards from 125 to 50 initial removals + 4 signs after that (these numbers don't add up to the required 200 sign removals); PLUM lowered the minimum takedown square footage per sign from 300 square feet (minimum billboard size) to 200 square feet (poster board size); PLUM opened the door to extend the digital billboard program to a 30-year contract instead of the CPC recommended 20-year contract. I agree with Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles that the placement of offsite commercial advertising on Metro-owned and controlled property in partnership with the City subjects users of public spaces to unwanted sales pitches for goods and services and is antithetical to the idea that citizens should have public spaces/visual environment free of crass commercialization. Please send the Ordinances back to the City Planning Commission for reconsideration. Thank you for your time and consideration,
-Richard Devletian

Communication from Public

Name: Ronnie perry

Date Submitted: 12/08/2023 08:31 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I am seriously opposed to the city TNC program. The public resources should not be leased or sold to private companies in some scheme to make money. Billboards are only around because of the private billboard companies lobbying our public council members. To me, this SMELLS. Billboards are ugly, they are distracting to drivers. They ring down the value of properties, digital billboards cause light pollution and much more danger as it is literally commercials that are intended to be watched!! Beauty matters. The scenic beauty of our city and state matters. Please vote against this!!

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 12/08/2023 08:35 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I strongly oppose the Metro TCN digital billboard advertising Program because of the impacts to housing, safety, historic-cultural, scenic, coastal, environmental and sensitive use resources. I ask the City Council to send the Metro TCN Program Ordinances back to the City Planning Commission for reconsideration per City Charter Sections 555 and 558, following substantive changes adopted by several motions introduced by Council Districts 1, 2, 5, 12, and 13. These changes include: PLUM restored freeway facing billboard FF-3 that was removed by CPC out of concern for saturation and public safety; PLUM reduced the CPC recommended distance of 2,640 feet to 1,500 feet between billboards on the same side of the freeway. This will set a negative precedent for all future signs, especially in the downtown area; PLUM expanded the hours of operation for freeway facing signs; PLUM reduced the number of existing static billboards to be removed prior to installation of new digital billboards from 125 to 50 initial removals + 4 signs after that (these numbers don't add up to the required 200 sign removals); PLUM lowered the minimum takedown square footage per sign from 300 square feet (minimum billboard size) to 200 square feet (poster board size); PLUM opened the door to extend the digital billboard program to a 30-year contract instead of the CPC recommended 20-year contract. I agree with Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles that the placement of offsite commercial advertising on Metro-owned and controlled property in partnership with the City subjects users of public spaces to unwanted sales pitches for goods and services and is antithetical to the idea that citizens should have public spaces/visual environment free of crass commercialization. Please send the Ordinances back to the City Planning Commission for reconsideration. Thank you, R Steward

Communication from Public

Name: Barbara Mesney

Date Submitted: 12/08/2023 08:53 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: Absolutely against digital billboards. They represent even MORE distracted driving. Distracted driving, due to texting, GPS systems, onboard video, and the like, has made driving in Los Angeles an extremely hazardous and life-threatening experience. So many drivers going through red lights!!! Digital billboards will exacerbate an already lethal situation. Please stop their possible use!

Communication from Public

Name: Barbara Broide

Date Submitted: 12/08/2023 05:04 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I am providing a transcript of my comments presented at the PLUM hearing of 12/6/23: Thank you. Council Members, thank you for your attention. On Item Number 22, The Metropolitan Transportation Communication Network. I call your attention to the fact, before I start speaking to our Neighborhood Council's opposition, that the current ordinance before you does not agree with itself. There are inconsistencies. It was difficult to hear of some of the modifications proposed to address all of them, but the numbers don't add up. The charts don't agree with one another. This is not ready for approval today. There are issues related to lead agency status. This program gives your authority to Metro. You were not a participant actively in the EIR processing, of which there were many issues and problems. And in the future, this Council will have no control over a program that will steal revenues from your beloved Sidewalk Amenities Program, the Bus Shelter Program, that relies on advertising dollars in order to provide transit shelters for our transit riders. If you were an advertiser, where would you put your billboard – on the 405 at the 10 intersection? Or on a transit shelter? Think about it. Planning and Land Use issues – we have a priority in L.A. for housing. No one has reviewed these properties for their potential to provide housing, and in fact some of them are on Metro's Joint Property Development List, others comply with ED1. According to our own ZIMAS program. This is an issue, this is a problem. What's more important - billboards or housing? Parks – We're a park poor city. We're supposed to be protecting our parks. ZIMAS identifies a number of properties within close proximity to our open space, our L.A. river, and yet you're about to approve louvers and digital signs overhanging these parks, which we need and value. Talk about impacts on resources? Union Station – I have postcards going back to the 1930's showing Union Station. Are we going to have postcards 30 years from now that show Union Station dwarfed by a 1,200 plus square foot digital billboard? Really? Angels Flight – a historic monument in our City? Digital Billboard in the photograph? There is something wrong with this program that none of you has looked at, to say nothing of the transportation impacts. This program is a transportation communications network program that never saw the light of day in the Transportation Committee. Why? Probably

because no one wanted to raise the issues of driver distraction. Driver distraction is a proven cause of accidents. We had emergency room physicians testifying at Planning Department Hearings. But the Planning Department told us they had to hurry this along. Council President wanted it approved before the end of the year. This is the PLUM Committee – you have a duty to look at this in detail, and to claim back your authority and have an impact on what happens in this City for the next 20 to 30 years. Hours of operation weren't addressed. Katy Yaroslavsky raised those at the last meeting of this committee. These changes haven't gone to the neighborhood councils. They likely should come back to CPC to comply with L.A. Municipal Code. That hasn't happened. Louvers – louvers are on some park signs, not on others. Protection of people who live near the signs – there's no way to deal with that after the case. And by the way, LAX has a whole handful of signs in the proximity of the airport. I personally negotiated with the lobbyists for LAX when they established the LAX Sign District. They promised to remove signs in the proximity of the airport that were outside of the grounds of the airport in exchange of getting generous rights for on-campus signage. They got those rights, we got signs removed, and now you're going to put them back. That doesn't seem right. The City can do better and should do better. You want signs and revenue? Then make a plan, under the City's control.

Communication from Public

Name: Donald A Seligman

Date Submitted: 12/08/2023 06:53 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I strongly oppose the Metro TCN digital billboard advertising Program because of the impacts to housing, safety, historic-cultural, scenic, coastal, environmental and sensitive use resources. I ask the City Council to send the Metro TCN Program Ordinances back to the City Planning Commission for reconsideration per City Charter Sections 555 and 558, following substantive changes adopted by several motions introduced by Council Districts 1, 2, 5, 12, and 13. These changes include: PLUM restored freeway facing billboard FF-3 that was removed by CPC out of concern for saturation and public safety; PLUM reduced the CPC recommended distance of 2,640 feet to 1,500 feet between billboards on the same side of the freeway. This will set a negative precedent for all future signs, especially in the downtown area; PLUM expanded the hours of operation for freeway facing signs; PLUM reduced the number of existing static billboards to be removed prior to installation of new digital billboards from 125 to 50 initial removals + 4 signs after that (these numbers don't add up to the required 200 sign removals); PLUM lowered the minimum takedown square footage per sign from 300 square feet (minimum billboard size) to 200 square feet (poster board size); PLUM opened the door to extend the digital billboard program to a 30-year contract instead of the CPC recommended 20-year contract. I agree with Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles that the placement of offsite commercial advertising on Metro-owned and controlled property in partnership with the City subjects users of public spaces to unwanted sales pitches for goods and services and is antithetical to the idea that citizens should have public spaces/visual environment free of crass commercialization. Please send the Ordinances back to the City Planning Commission for reconsideration. Thank you, Donald Seligman, D.D.S. Jon E. Zimmermann, Ph.D.

Communication from Public

Name: Eric Sorensen

Date Submitted: 12/08/2023 07:48 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I strongly oppose the Metro TCN digital billboard advertising Program because of the impacts to housing, safety, historic-cultural, scenic, coastal, environmental and sensitive use resources. I ask the City Council to send the Metro TCN Program Ordinances back to the City Planning Commission for reconsideration per City Charter Sections 555 and 558, following substantive changes adopted by several motions introduced by Council Districts 1, 2, 5, 12, and 13. These changes include: • PLUM restored freeway facing billboard FF-3 that was removed by CPC out of concern for saturation and public safety; • PLUM reduced the CPC recommended distance of 2,640 feet to 1,500 feet between billboards on the same side of the freeway. This will set a negative precedent for all future signs, especially in the downtown area; • PLUM expanded the hours of operation for freeway facing signs; • PLUM reduced the number of existing static billboards to be removed prior to installation of new digital billboards from 125 to 50 initial removals + 4 signs after that (these numbers don't add up to the required 200 sign removals); • PLUM lowered the minimum takedown square footage per sign from 300 square feet (minimum billboard size) to 200 square feet (poster board size); • PLUM opened the door to extend the digital billboard program to a 30-year contract instead of the CPC recommended 20-year contract. I agree with Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles that the placement of offsite commercial advertising on Metro-owned and controlled property in partnership with the City subjects users of public spaces to unwanted sales pitches for goods and services and is antithetical to the idea that citizens should have public spaces/visual environment free of crass commercialization. Please send the Ordinances back to the City Planning Commission for reconsideration. Thank you, Eric Sorensen

Communication from Public

Name: Chris

Date Submitted: 12/08/2023 07:51 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I strongly oppose the Metro TCN digital billboard advertising Program because of the impacts to housing, safety, historic-cultural, scenic, coastal, environmental and sensitive use resources. I ask the City Council to send the Metro TCN Program Ordinances back to the City Planning Commission for reconsideration per City Charter Sections 555 and 558, following substantive changes adopted by several motions introduced by Council Districts 1, 2, 5, 12, and 13. These changes include: PLUM restored freeway facing billboard FF-3 that was removed by CPC out of concern for saturation and public safety; PLUM reduced the CPC recommended distance of 2,640 feet to 1,500 feet between billboards on the same side of the freeway. This will set a negative precedent for all future signs, especially in the downtown area; PLUM expanded the hours of operation for freeway facing signs; PLUM reduced the number of existing static billboards to be removed prior to installation of new digital billboards from 125 to 50 initial removals + 4 signs after that (these numbers don't add up to the required 200 sign removals); PLUM lowered the minimum takedown square footage per sign from 300 square feet (minimum billboard size) to 200 square feet (poster board size); PLUM opened the door to extend the digital billboard program to a 30-year contract instead of the CPC recommended 20-year contract. I agree with Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles that the placement of offsite commercial advertising on Metro-owned and controlled property in partnership with the City subjects users of public spaces to unwanted sales pitches for goods and services and is antithetical to the idea that citizens should have public spaces/visual environment free of crass commercialization. Please send the Ordinances back to the City Planning Commission for reconsideration. Thank you,

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 12/08/2023 08:01 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I strongly oppose digital billboards! They are visual pollutants and detract from the natural beauty of our wonderful city. Please stand up to greedy business owners and do the right thing for the future of our city! Thank you